UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
BANGALORE CITY.

LIBRARY COPY

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

VOL. XVIII OCTOBER 1947 No. 10

GREAT IDEAS

[We have culled a few pregnant ideas from the writings of Gandhiji, whose good counsel we fervently hope will prevail with all who are labouring for the Cause of Human Freedom. We offer them to our readers for reflection.—ED.]

There is an indefinable mysterious power that pervades everything. I feel it though I do not see it....It transcends the senses...sense perceptions can be, and often are, false and deceptive, however real they may appear to us.
—*Young India*, 11th October 1928.

To realize God is to see Him in all that lives *i.e.* to realize our oneness with all creation.
—*Harijan*, 14th May 1938.

It is good enough to talk of God whilst we are sitting here after a nice breakfast and looking forward to a nicer luncheon, but how am I to talk of God to the millions who have to go without two meals a day?
—*Young India*, 15th October 1931.

Spiritual laws, like Nature's laws, need no enacting, they are self-acting...."As with the individual so with the Universe" is an unfailing principle which we would do well to lay to heart.
—*Young India*, 14th January 1920.

The sum-total of the experience of the Sages of the world is available to us and would be for all time to come.
—*Young India*, 21st April 1927.

I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him, and if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent.
—*Young India*, 4th December 1924.

Mere sacrifice without discipline will be unavailing.
—*Young India*, 20th October 1920.

Yajna means an act directed to the welfare of others done without receiving or desiring a return for

it, whether of a temporal or spiritual nature. "Act" here must be taken in its widest sense and includes thought and word, as well as deed. "Others" embraces not only humanity, but all life.

—From *Yeravda Mandir*.

I have never lost my optimism. In seemingly darkest hours hope has burnt bright within me. I cannot kill the hope myself. I must say I cannot give an ocular demonstration to justify the hope. But there is no defeat in me.

—*Harijan*, 25th January 1935.

THE CALL

Thy flickerless purpose how can I fulfil
Unless thy hidden flame thou wilt reveal ?
For every friendless spark born in my heart
Is thine albeit I claim its science and art.

Thy melody thou showerest lavishly
O lone Composer of all euphony,
From carols of birds to moaning monsoon thunders
'Tis thou, Lord, sing'st when life peals out thy wonders.

From the green of sprouting leaves to the ocean's blue,
From the maid's shy blush to sundawn's garish hue,
From firefly glints to lightning's lurid gleams,
Through lustre's endless gamut 'tis thy love streams.

But far transcending all thy earthly moods
Thy sentinel timeless Self our earth o'erbroods
And, poised beyond thy gala of glare and grace,
Calls Soul to union—marvellous, fathomless.

DILIP KUMAR ROY

REVOLUTION—EAST AND WEST

I.—BY GORDON CLOUGH

[Here is a real and penetrating analysis of the prevailing world chaos, out of which a cosmos can be fashioned by the plan outlined by **Gordon Clough**. The virile stand of the young American who writes this article must challenge the respect of even those readers whose conviction it may not altogether command. The trend to authoritarianism is strong but the ultimate check to unjustifiable encroachments, political, economic, social, ecclesiastical or scientific, upon the dignity of the individual, is the power of the will focussed in one small human frame. There is hope for the modern world while there are young men able, like our contributor, to think things through without fear or favour, firm in demanding a revolution in human standards and prepared to maintain, if need be, against the world "the moral potentiality of the human soul."—ED.]

India appears to have reached a successful culmination of the first stage of a Good Revolution. What has been revolutionized—and this is why India's revolution is good—is the hitherto accepted belief that the power of the State must inevitably rule over the aspirations of the individual. Behind the scenes of political organization Gandhi taught two key doctrines—individual aspiration and individual fearlessness—and non-violent revolution was therefore possible. The only way to be revolutionary in respect to a superior physical power is to cease being afraid of it, a lesson actually learned by the Gandhi-inspired devotees of freedom.

Whether political independence in India will become the corner-stone of a "continuing revolution" which perpetually demands that the State be physically impotent instead of physically compelling, is a matter to be decided in the next quarter of a century. In concrete political terms, the alternatives would seem to be—will the new, independent Indian State choose to implement the equitable distribution of Indian resources by a highly developed centralized power or will the revolution continue to be *sui generis* as it began, with revolutions in the various provinces rendering large land holdings inoperable through local non-co-operation?

The intent of this presentation is to suggest that the most effective factor in producing needed social change is a revolutionary attitude of mind rather than military and police power. And it is only if Gandhi's performance for the former becomes a philosophic impetus to changes yet to come, that India's example can be clearly seen to have a direct bearing upon the "revolutionary" needs of the United States and England.

The acceptance of the authority of force is a policy made respectable only by the length of time which has elapsed since it was effectively

questioned. This doctrine is at present accepted by the majority in the United States, as in England, in a manner similar to the pre-Gandhian acceptance of subservience to British rule in India. The problem in all instances has been conscription. Just as Britain conscripted Indian resources and, through more subtle means, Indian man-power, so the present citizens of Western countries feel that there is no satisfactory alternative to accepting as inevitable conscription into a peace-time army, and, except for a few remnants of anarchic opinion, there does not exist much courage to openly defy any laws of the State at which the individual conscience wishes to rebel.

The predicament of the individual in the U. S. A., viewed in political and social terms, is not essentially different from the former predicament of Indians in a vassal State. Due to the intense centralization of economic power, as well as the ever-present threat of military control by an enlarged War Department, each person, as a person, finds that fewer and fewer decisions are his to make. The "Machine" becomes larger and man becomes significant only to the degree that he lubricates its operation, whether the "Machine" be the Army, the Navy, General Motors or Standard Oil. People, as a columnist said recently, are "those strange bipeds who can be pushed around indefinitely as long as you just tell them that they are being made free"—and the forces inimical to human progress and enlightenment have long thrived on the use of this knowledge. Today, the State in every land except India —and the danger there is by no means successfully passed—is an overbearing moral monitor. Further, modern society in the "wealthy" Western nations has become so tightly routinized that it assumes the character of a mechanism which grinds on without human consciousness or control. More and more, things happen *to* people.

In the United States a conscription bill is passed—due to various forms of political manœuvring completely beyond the understanding of the average citizen. But the average citizen is none-the-less required to relinquish his individuality and serve a term under the direct control of the War Department. He is told that it is his duty to shoot, bomb and otherwise incapacitate human beings whenever so ordered. An atom bomb was produced which utilized the labour force of 125,000 construction and factory workers—none of whom knew what they were working on—not that if they had they would have had an opportunity to determine whether they would approve its use in securing the capitulation of a "national enemy"! The trend in its direct relationship to the responsibility of the individual has been succinctly summarized by Dwight Macdonald, Editor of the radical magazine *Politics*, who writes of "all this emphasis that perfect automatism, that absolute lack of human consciousness or aims which

our society is rapidly achieving," and adds that

> the elements of our society act and react, regardless of ideologies or personalities, until The Bomb explodes over Hiroshima. The more commonplace the personalities and senseless the institutions, the more grandiose the destruction. It is *Götterdämmerung* without the gods....

A materialistic civilization rises from the belief that the fittest are those who wield the greatest temporal power, and that those who wield the greatest power will survive. The attainment of sufficient "survival power" makes strenuous demands upon all the vital energies of the human beings concerned, producing the familiar characteristics of the modern militarized State. It is necessary to examine this broad social consequence of modern materialism in some detail, for it is rapidly becoming the most obvious focus for the play of the collective karma of the twentieth century. The peoples who become the "strongest" must devote themselves to protecting their material guarantees of strength, and this, in the course of Nationalistic history, has always meant vigilant and effective militarization. In the process it is necessary for the individual citizen to relinquish a large portion of individual judgment in the interest of "military necessity"—else he weakens the military power upon which he depends. Therefore the most important question which can be asked the modern man who has sought security or protection through organized might, is whether or not he can have a life of moral growth while supporting a highly organized form of society which tends to make all crucial decisions *for* him.

This problem is objectively focussed in modern warfare, because social opinion does not encourage the individual to decide *on moral grounds* whether or not he should join an army or pay taxes for the maintenance of military institutions. The individual has a certain specious type of choice—he can refuse the military, but he cannot do so and retain a respected place in society. And, unless he is dedicated to a philosophy which gives genuine preeminence to spiritual realities, he will think his "place in society" is his only refuge.

The prevailing trend is toward reduction of the individual to a moral cipher. This predicament is well expressed in the remarks of a twenty-two-year-old Lieutenant in the Army Air Force, holder of the D.S.C. and the Purple Heart, who was selected at random for a "profile" in *The New Yorker* the summer before last. "...It boils down to this. I am a cog in one hell of a big machine. I don't particularly like it, but there it is....Whenever I get set to do something, something a lot bigger than me comes along and pushes me into place."

Of similar significance might be the case of the two Tibetans who were conscripted first into the Russian and then into the German

army, successfully "being fought" as *matériel* without being able to speak the language of either "country" they were supposedly fighting for, and being entirely at a loss to know what everything was about. From the conventional military point of view, these men were our allies when they were "fought" for Russia, our enemies when they were "fought" for Germany, and allies once again when the British finally secured possession of them on the Western Front. Obviously, this is an extreme example of the thesis presented, a *reductio ad absurdum*—yet to the extent that many fighting men of the democratic countries fought for no other reason than that they were pushed into place, an amoral similarity exists between them and the unfortunate Tibetans.

It is doubtful whether any one would have the temerity to say that this world trend is desirable, though it is forcefully defended on the ground that it is necessary. The necessity was clearly stated by Norman Angell (who, curiously enough, was a Nobel Peace Prize winner) in his book *Let the People Know*. His key passage is as follows:—

> It is the right of a nation as of every living thing to commit injustice to defend its existence.

The Indian revolution raises a question out of Mr. Angell's context which might be paraphrased "What *part* of my existence as an individual do I wish to defend?" If we are to place exclusive emphasis upon insuring our *physical* protection, the world has long been on the right track. But, if real human existence resides in the moral awareness of the human personality or individuality, we are instead on the road to liquidating the concepts of conscience, of freedom, and of responsibility.

If we think that man, as man, touches reality in *super*-physical terms it is necessary to start a revolution, for the world is against us. Gandhi seemed to have some such plan in mind despite the fact that the immediate goal was national independence. While it is obvious that Gandhi could not manufacture B-29's and atom bombs on spinning-wheels, the more important fact is that *he would not have used* them even had he cornered half the world's supply of these commodities. Gandhi led "his people" to an escape from the dehumanization of authoritarian government. And he led them on with a philosophy of "decentralization" which needs revolutionary application in the United States. The American people not only need a similar "escape" as the centralization of their own Government becomes tighter, but are secretly aware that they need it. The State, in popular consensus, is no longer the revered Stars and Stripes—(or Washington and Jefferson clasping hands over the Declaration of Independence)—the State has gradually come to be regarded as something akin to a tornado or an earthquake—which does unavoidable things *to* you.

Unless the generalized contentions

hitherto developed have no basis in fact, India needs to continue and to clarify her revolution, while *Individuals* in the United States need to start one. Of course, starting a good revolution is not an easy project. There is one kind you can start by joining the Communist Party, but your perseverance in this direction will only bring another and different authoritarian State which also must be revolted against. The only revolution which can promise anything definite is the revolution of one man. This kind of revolution can be accomplished at once, though this variety, even more than the Marxist concept of overthrowing Capitalism, requires perseverance, thought and planning beforehand. It can, however, bring immediate and continuing success *for the Individual* in terms of an ever-widening range of opportunities for the development of integrity.

Socrates staged a revolution of this variety in Athens. He seemed to be much more pleased with its results than were the guardians of the Athenian State when they proved they were bigger than Socrates' body by administering the form of poison then most popular in subduing recalcitrants. Henry David Thoreau had the same idea, although his generation was too kindly to do more than incarcerate him briefly in the Concord Jail. Gandhi started in the same way. In order to illustrate that a consistent revolutionary *attitude*, at least, is possible in the United States a small document known as the "Independents' Manifesto" may be appropriately quoted—the result of the deliberations of a small pacifist-socialist group in Los Angeles.

The Independents

1. We are not a political party—we are not even an organization. We are "revolutionary" in varying degrees—but only as individuals, not as a group.

2. We profess no interest in any specific religion, and are in favour of the substitution of individual creative thought for theological belief.

3. We are not looking for members, nor for endorsement. We are simply interested in knowing how many friends we have—if any. *Some* day we *might* want a temporary organization, for instance, in order more successfully to combat or defy military conscription; we might want to start a new educational institution; we might want to establish centres of community living for men of like minds; we might even, God forbid, feel that we had to form a new political party in 1970.

Here Is What We Seem to Believe in Common

1. The trend of the modern world is to reduce the individual human being to the rôle of a cog in a big machine called The State. The chief agency for this reduction of the significance of the individual is State conscription for armed service. This was true in Germany—it was and is true in Russia—it is true wherever there are bureaucracies and armies.

2. We decline to be impressed by either powerful bureaucrats or powerful militarists. We plan to refuse any and all military conscription.

3. We realize that the war-making power of the modern State—which we intend to challenge directly as individuals—is not the fault of a few "evil" men. It seems clearly the compounded result of our entire culture. We question all, or nearly all, of the supposedly established values of that culture.

a. We question conventional values and attitudes in respect to patriotism —in so far as patriotism manifests in a competitive or violent manner *vs.* other nations.

b. We question the value of any and all sectarian religions, though we may ourselves be, for all we know, rather deeply religious people.

c. We question the theory of purely "private" property.

d. We question the theories of State Socialism, and regard with disfavour its presentation as an alternative to "Capitalism."

e. We question conventional values and attitudes in respect to sex and family relationships—since these conceptions do not seem to have helped us become more human.

f. We choose, in so far as we hold ourselves to be capable, to live as free individuals, making our own choices on the basis of our own considered judgments and regarding as irrelevant to our ends any censure or punishment which our "revolutionary" ideas or actions may bring us. We are not "against everything" because we relish the predicament as such, but simply because we wish to find better values to assert in our own lives. Our "revolution" is an attempt to learn how to become socially responsible by learning how to become free.

We would be interested in responses —including either criticisms or approvals.

Similar exhortations and arguments never fail to appeal to something in the nature of most human beings. The fact that they usually fail to achieve actual results is due simply to the fact that such councils of action require a surety of belief that the real man is a moral man and not the highly advertised assortment of bones and organs he walks around in. If man is to act individually, he has to believe that there is something about the individual human soul that is important.

Western civilization has arbitrarily denied that there is any ground for such an assumption on two notable historical occasions. First came the teaching that man was inherently sinful and unimportant, his only chance being in establishing a satisfactory personal relationship with the Big Power—which in medieval times was designated by the word God. The next variation of this materialism was a supposedly scientific version: that man was a somewhat slimmer and taller ape who could expect the best from the "cosmic process," which had bred him, only by fighting and biting his way to a larger apportionment of physical sensations than that of the man next door.

Partially because he was the native son of a land that retained traditions asserting the real existence of soul and the subsidiary importance of things physical, Gandhi was able to believe that it was possible to

revolutionize materialistic human standards. He had faith in the moral potentiality of the human soul. This is the only corner-stone upon which it is possible to build a revolution that will last, because all revolutionists who do not hold this view, if confronted with the misfortunes of political reverses, become frightened; and when a revolutionary becomes frightened another reactionary is born.

The American or the Indian who feels that he must assert the necessity of a thoughtful revolution comes, therefore, face to face with a "new" form of religion: a religion that has vitality precisely because it is based upon a real belief in the dignity and importance of the individual man rather than upon the awesome might of any coercive authority. Conversely, the man who becomes philosophically convinced that life is for the purposes of the soul rather than the purposes of the body immediately becomes a part of the political and social revolution described—whether he planned to do so or not. If man is a soul and not a body, all of our institutions are based upon an incorrect premise and are therefore perverted. In this realization real religion and real politics meet, and here, it might be suggested, lies the only salvation for Modern Man.

It could be hoped, therefore, that the modern man of India become not too modern lest he have to retrace the same unnecessary steps taken by the majority of his Western brethren. For those who are not sure that there is any such thing as "soul" a certain admonition might none-the-less be considered: If by any chance spiritual and moral reality *should* prove to be more "real" than physical "reality" he will have all his psychological investments in a failing enterprise. And things begin to look this way. The only potentially helpful news that the atom bomb actually brings is that if we persist in believing that our well-being must be protected by physical might, we will eventually lose every vestige of even the physical security the West prizes so highly.

GORDON CLOUGH

"One of the most astonishing phenomena of our time is the propaganda of slavery carried on among the masses, not only by governments who profit by it, but by men who advocate socialistic theories and regard themselves as champions of freedom.

"These men affirm that the amelioration of life and the adjustment of the facts of life to our sense of what ought to be, will come about not by the personal efforts of individuals, but spontaneously by a violent reconstruction of society by somebody. They say that people need not go on their own feet to where they wish to go and ought to go, but that some kind of a floor will be placed under them which will carry them where they ought to go without their having to use their own feet. Accordingly all their efforts should be directed not to proceeding as far as their strength will allow towards the spot they wish to reach, but towards arranging this imaginary floor, without moving from the spot where they are standing."

LEO TOLSTOY

II.—BY KISHORLAL G. MASHRUWALLA

[**Shri Kishorlal G. Mashruwala,** whose reaction to Mr. Gordon Clough's article on " Revolution East and West " we publish here, has served as President of the Gandhi Seva Sangha, an order of service known throughout India. He has been a close associate of Gandhiji's for many years but he would like it understood that the views which he expresses here are his independent considered opinions and are not to be taken as those of the great Indian leader. Shri Mashruwala would like the interested reader's attention drawn to the " Prefatory Observations " which he wrote for Shri R. R. Diwakar's *Satyagraha : Its Technique and History,* observations which bear directly on this subject and are highly interesting.—ED.]

It does not seem to me that the laws governing the birth and growth of a revolution are different for East and West. Man appears to me to be fundamentally the same everywhere, acting and reacting to like impulses and situations in the same manner, if we examine him deeply enough. Differences of civilization, very wide and irreconcilable as they might seem, are more superficial than we are apt to believe.

The ordinary man—that is, a very large majority of human beings—is generally too much occupied with his personal worries to afford to have a very delicate conscience or a hypersensitive nature. He is prepared to tolerate evil to a considerably larger extent than sensitive men can. If, for the time being, the evil is essential for his personal well-being, he will even support and abet it. Not that he does not want it to be removed. Not that he does not complain against it. But, except at certain psychological moments, his will is too weak to take or actively support radical measures to remove it. This is particularly so, if the resort to radical measures would require him to make heavy sacrifices or alterations in his routine way of life. He wants delivery from evil, provided that the delivery is painless, or that the reform gets well established before he is called upon to implement it, or that the sacrifices or alterations demanded for the purpose are levied upon all generally.

While this is the general attitude of the masses, there are always some men in every society who feel the evil more keenly than others. This may be due to two causes :—the evil has hit them personally in so bitter a manner that it is impossible for them to get used or adjusted to it ; or, they are men with abnormally delicate conscience and sensitiveness and are either less worried by their personal affairs or endowed with a spirit of chivalry and adventure and a stern purpose in life, which enables them to disregard all personal and private discomforts.

There is no nation as there is no age in which such people will not be found. Everywhere it is these people who, under proper conditions,

become the pioneers of a revolution.

Mr. Clough says, "Gandhi taught two key doctrines—individual aspiration and individual fearlessness—and non-violent revolution was therefore possible." I think this is not well put in respect of "individual aspiration." The pioneer revolutionaries, to my mind, are not—ought not to be—fired with an *individual* aspiration in the ordinary sense, that is, desire to attain to some position of power or prosperity in society. If this exists, it is hardly a healthy sign for a revolution. If it is an other-worldly individual aspiration, it is a different matter. The other-worldliness might be altogether fanciful from the point of view of a rationalist. But such individual aspiration can become a helping factor in a revolution. I do not, however, think that its existence is an indispensable condition. In the words of Mr. Clough, it is possible for a revolutionary "to question the value of any and all sectarian religions though he himself may be, for all he knows, a rather deeply religious man." But, as far as matters of this world are concerned, the aspiration which must move him should be to see *others* delivered from an evil. So far as he is personally concerned the evil might be even advantageous to him. The spirit or aspiration which moves him is that of a seed, which consents to destroy itself in order that a noble tree may grow out of it.

Then Mr. Clough puts down the above two doctrines as conditions precedent for a "non-violent" revolution. It seems to me that all revolutions are non-violent at the time of their conception and for a considerable time during their growth. Whether and how far they continue to be so after they have become strong and gathered momentum depends upon several factors which cannot be foretold. Whether a revolution germinates in the form of a religious movement, such as Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Jainism, Vaishnavism etc., or of a political movement—as in France, Russia and modern India—or of a social movement, such as the abolition of slavery in the U. S. A., or of untouchability here, the first man who gave the idea and his followers did so non-violently; they suffered without a thought of retaliation. They might have tried to save themselves by fleeing or otherwise, but they never struck back, even when there was an opportunity. Perhaps, instinctively, they knew the futility of violence. But, not knowing that it was a wise instinct, they might have made a principle and a doctrine of it and adhered to it faithfully. But when these movements became powerful enough for achieving their purpose, or when their labours had come to a successful end and the season for fruit-gathering came, most of the members of the revolution generally bade good-bye to the doctrine, while a few faithful ones retired or took to social and humanitarian activities. The instinct having disappeared, the

doctrine—the rationalization of the instinct—could not stand. There need be no wonder if this happens in India too. India should not be regarded as a country of exceptional human beings.

A few words about the "Independents' Manifesto" reproduced by Mr. Gordon Clough. With deference, it seems to me that the signatories are labouring under some misconceptions. It is clear that they are all agreed on the following proposition: They are not satisfied with the political organization, the various religious sects and their beliefs, and the educational, social and economic institutions of their country, and they would not tolerate military conscription. They have some other views also in common. They want far-reaching changes in human society, but are not quite clear about their form.

Read in this light, it will be seen that all the seeds of an organization are present. In fact they are already organized, though loosely. The fact that their views are not crystallized in the form of set doctrines does not matter. They are—or possess the characteristics of being—what they want to resist, namely, "a cog in a big machine." At present their thoughts are in a fluidic state. But they do not wish to remain in that unsettled condition always. They seek light; they await the appearance amidst them of a master mind, who will find appropriate language for expressing their sentiments in the form of perfect principles and harnessing their energies for systematically implementing them. When such a master appears on the scene, they will gladly and religiously throw in their lot with him and become the missionaries of his and their cause. Their present frame of mind is like that of John the Baptist and his disciples awaiting the arrival of Jesus. In spite of themselves, they wish to be "cogs" of a machine, provided it is one of their own choice.

In a way we are all "cogs" and will always remain so. Even the Master who seems to devise and set the new machine—the founder of the new era—is himself a superior cog of a machine planned by a Superior Master. We cannot escape that destiny. But if the machine in which we are at present set has become fit to be discarded, it has got to be done away with and replaced by a better one. The master, who plans and sets the new machine, and his colleagues are *willing* cogs. A willing cog is a live soul; the unwilling one, one forced to be a cog, is an automaton. The soul cog, being the sound part of the machine that has to be discarded, gets out of it before its removal; the other ones share the fate of the machine. A majority of them might be saved and made parts of the new machine, but as mere automatons.

K. G. MASHRUWALA

SANTINIKETAN AND SEVAGRAM

[**Shri Gurdial Mallik** declares himself a disciple of Rabindranath Tagore who has been called Gurudeva. He was at Visva-Bharati for some years, having retired from active work there early this year. His love of song and his aspiration to the world of the spirit enable him to pen this fine appreciation of two of modern India's greatest leaders.—ED.]

The idealism and aspirations of modern India, broadly speaking, are summed up in two symbols: Santiniketan and Sevagram. Both these institutions came into being as a protest against the late-nineteenth-century values of the West: individualism, industrialism and imperialism, more particularly as these were reflected in the systems of administration and education introduced in this country.

Santiniketan rose Minerva-like from the head of a poet. For, the very first day on which Rabindranath Tagore sat down in a *sâl* avenue to be a playmate to three little children during the whole gamut of their youthful growth in the presence of Nature and their neighbours—the primitive people, the children of the human race—he presented to the professional schoolmaster an ideology in instruction which had on it the stamp of synthesis.

Sevagram, or its predecessor, Phoenix Ashrama in South Africa, or Sabarmati, on the other hand, was built brick on brick by an artisan who held honest manual labour as the primary principle of human existence, knowing as he did by faith that such labour gives both dignity and depth to man.

The poet had a vision of the oneness of all life and this he aimed at implementing in his forest hermitage, albeit adapted to changed conditions. Whatever stood in the way of the evolution of the inherent sense of unity, which dwells in the heart of every man, was therefore eliminated through study, self-discipline, service and song.

The ploughman, as Gandhiji may well be metaphorically called, with his philosophy, at once pragmatic and practical, of "One step enough for me," began with a conscious cultivation of every attribute which would aid him in effacing his ego gradually till he touched what is common to all.

In short, the *motif* of one was mysticism, while that of the other was asceticism.

And it is obvious that in the arduous task of regeneration, whether individual or collective, both these views and ways of life are absolutely necessary. For we need liberty as well as law, vision as well as virtue, the watch-tower as well as the workshop.

The mystic is like the flower which grows in sunshine and in shower. Therefore, he accepts everything, he

rejects nothing. He is a kind of a witness to the ever-unfolding pageant of life.

The ascetic, on the other hand, is a sort of a servant who scrubs and scours one by one the pots and pans of the scullery till each one of them shines. Or he is a warrior, who struggles at every step to go nearer to the goal of his heart's desire or his soul's dream.

The impact of the intellectual ethos of England, though confined to a microscopic minority of our educated countrymen, had brought in its train scepticism, softness and snobbery. Thus, a sort of "moral proletariat" had sprung up in our country. It was cut off from the traditions of the past, which govern a people's character and conduct in a rhythmic manner. And following the precedent initiated by their like-minded fellow-countrymen of the previous generation, both the Singer of Santiniketan and the Spinner of Sevagram raised their banner of revolt against the "proselytising" of the young by the politics and polish of the money-minded civilisation from across the seas. This entailed their giving up their respective careers of cushioned comfort and big bank balances. The poet exchanged his flute of beauty in the environs of his aristocratic upbringing and activity, for the sword of duty. The pleader left the premises of the law-court, with all its prospects of the proverbial goose that lays the golden eggs, to plough the stubborn, sandy soil. But both were actuated by a spirit of self-sacrifice akin—to compare small things with great—to that of Gautama Buddha and Jesus Christ, who surrendered the "kingdoms" promised to them, for the sake of service of the "great orphan humanity." Once again, thus, the truth of the ages and the sages was illustrated that sacrifice is the seed of the evolution and advancement of mankind; nay, of all Life.

The poet sang:—

"When one knows thee, then alien there is none, then no door is shut. Oh, grant me my prayer that I may never lose the bliss of the touch of the One in the play of the many."

And he revealed and radiated this "touch of the One" in the fields of literature and art, education and rural reconstruction.

And the ploughman-*cum*-spinner confirmed the perpetual presence of the "One in the play of the many" from his side:—

"He (God) is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the pathmaker is breaking stones. He is with them in sun and in shower, and his garment is covered with dust. Put off thy holy mantle and even like him come down on the dusty soil!"

Both cast away the crown,—and who does not covet it?—of personal paradisiacal salvation and engaged themselves in the work of the world with a view to making and leaving it better than they had found it.

"Deliverance? Where is the deliverance to be found? Our master himself has joyfully taken upon him the

bonds of creation; he is bound with us all for ever."

In short, Santiniketan and Sevagram deepened the inherent human urge for perfection as against what passes muster under the protean term "progress." And the best and truest expression of perfection, in spirit as well as in substance, is simplicity. As the Poet has said somewhere, "Simplicity is the physiognomy of perfection."

And has it not always been so? The prophet or the poet has found himself, while passing through the corridors of history, side by side with the priest or the ploughman. In our times the priest has failed to fulfil his holy avocation and the prophet has not as yet appeared. In their place, however, we have witnessed the sublime spectacle of the poet and the ploughman travelling together to the Temple of Truth. And Truth has generally been approached along the avenues of *ananda*—joy—and asceticism. This may be the explanation of the observation which the Poet made on one occasion: "Santiniketan represents the *ananda* of Truth, Sabarmati, the *tapasya* of Truth." And is not Truth the Beautiful Bird with two wings or the Tree with two birds sitting on its branches?

GURDIAL MALLIK

LET US BE TRUE TO OUR HERITAGE!

A strong appeal to all Indians to "be true to our heritage" was made by Mr. K. G. Saiyidain, Educational Adviser to the Government of Bombay, in *The Bombay Chronicle Freedom Supplement*, on August 15th. Political liberty attained, he wrote, meant only that the decks had been cleared for action against all the forces and tendencies that had held India back, including moral inertia, and for which the blame could no longer be placed upon our foreign rulers. We could, he said, realise the promise of the great opportunity that is now ours

> only if we can keep our hold steadfast on the great moral and spiritual values which give meaning to life—an uncompromising passion for fairness and justice, a willing tolerance of differences, a sensitive social conscience, belief in the ultimate triumph of right, and the balanced vision of a life-pattern in which the material and the spiritual, the moral and the economic do not clash as irreconcilable antagonists but fuse into an integral unity.

These values, now in eclipse, were those which our finest spirits had always cherished and "for which, in recent years, men like Tagore and Iqbal and Gandhi and Zakir Husain" had laboured, "practising them in their life and urging them in poetry and prose of unforgettable power." It is that community of great ideals which makes our India one and which must in the long run set at naught the artificial barriers made by politics.

THE CHALLENGE OF VIVISECTION

INDIA'S GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

"I abhor vivisection with my whole soul."—GANDHIJI.

[One of the most paradoxical features of our age of contradictions is the deliberate doing of evil in the hope that good may come, the perpetration of fiendish cruelty upon helpless creatures in the name of benevolence towards man. In a world united by life and governed by law it is impossible that good long-run results should come, to life at the human level, from torturing the life in less developed forms. Men's sensibilities have been blunted by long indoctrination with the lie that the fruits of cruelty are indispensable to human health. Immunisation is a medical superstition, a fetish, a passing fad of which the men of future centuries will speak with the abhorrence it deserves, not only for the cruelty to animals which it encourages but also for the human misery it has caused and must cause. Humanity can never hope for lasting peace while vivisection is tolerated. We share the hope which **Mrs. E. Westacott** expresses here that free India will set her face inexorably against the perpetuation of this iniquity.—ED.]

M. K. Gandhi is reported to have condemned Vivisection as "the blackest crime of civilization" and the years have justified his statement.

The dissection of the living body —sometimes of men, but more usually of animals—has persisted down the centuries from Roman times, and William Penn saw the opening of a living dog at Oxford in the seventeenth century. With the invention of the microscope and the discovery of the cell, scientific experimentation upon the living organism received an immense impetus, but the gigantic proportions to which it has grown during the past century have resulted largely from the teaching and example of Louis Pasteur, who used dogs and rabbits to establish his treatment for rabies. Many French and German scientists sacrificed holocausts of animal victims in the mad search for germs popularized by Pasteur, and suspicion was aroused in England that gruesome experiments were being introduced from the Continent into British laboratories, which led to the appointment of the first Royal Commission in 1875.

The influence of the Association for the Advancement of Science transformed the measure for animal protection, framed by such anti-Vivisectionists as Miss Frances Power Cobbe and Lord Shaftesbury, into an instrument to protect those who performed the experiments, so that the Vivisection Act of 1876 legalized these experiments by the granting of licences under certain restrictive conditions relating to anæsthesia and

the prevention of suffering. Subsequently these conditions could be annulled by the grant of special certificates !

At that time 400 experiments were being performed in Britain per year and anti-Vivisection witnesses warned the Commission that legalization would enormously increase the number. This is exactly what happened. When the second Royal Commission met thirty years later the figures ran into hundreds of thousands and public opinion had correspondingly hardened. The Commissioners declared that as people generally condoned the slaughter of animals for food it was not possible to prohibit their use for the advancement of science. Since then (1912) figures of Vivisectional experiments have mounted year by year, until the total for 1944 reached its highest point—1,323, 983—for Britain alone, while the hardening process culminated in the Bikini atrocity in which, by authority of the United States Government, atomic bombs were dropped upon animals in target ships.

The total of over a million experiments in one year is made up chiefly of those so-called " pin-prick " experiments, without any anæsthetic, which are in truth amongst the most terrible of the agonies inflicted by man upon his " younger brothers " in the scale of evolution. The hypodermic syringe has proved to be the means of producing in the physical bodies of all kinds of living creatures conditions of disease and suffering admitted by witnesses before the two Royal Commissions to be severe and prolonged. Other long-drawn-out periods of anguish have been those in which the victims have been kept for weeks without food till they died from slow starvation.

Vivisection has been closely associated with the false systems known as vaccine and serum therapy. The fear of germs—most of which are beneficial—others being of the nature of scavengers—has led to the abuse of animals in the production of lymph, antitoxin and other morbid substances. These, when passed through the horse, as in diphtheria antitoxin, or through rabbits or guinea-pigs, are finally injected into the human blood-stream, often with fatal results, as medical history has proved again and again, or with lifelong injury or invalidism, as the sequel to forcible blood-poisoning.

Biological experiments have involved the use of radium and radioactive rays, electrical devices and the testing of drugs upon the organs and life-processes of the creatures subjected to them, whilst later these same experiments have been applied to human patients with a resulting increase of suffering.

The folly and futility of cancer research, taking the form of ingenious methods of torture to promote tumours in rats and mice, cannot be over-estimated, and has not brought nearer either relief or cure, as is proved by the ever-rising cancer death-rate.

The way of science has not been uncontested. In all lands thinkers, who have been also possessed of knowledge, imagination and great-hearted sympathy, have denounced Vivisection for the evil thing it is. Since John Ruskin gave up his Slade Professorship of Art at Oxford when a laboratory was established in the University, men and women have laboured individually, and in Societies, to bring about what they knew to be the only satisfactory goal—the total abolition of experiments on all living animals. Such a Society has been The World League Against Vivisection and For Protection of Animals, which, originating with humane workers in Germany, formed an English Branch in 1900 that has been combating the evil ever since.

All anti-Vivisectionists owe a debt of gratitude to George Bernard Shaw who, in season and out, has exposed the vivisecting scientist as the dullard who is too stupid to create a humane way of obtaining the knowledge he wants, and therefore goes on repeating the cruel actions of other men. Shaw has likewise exposed the crudity, the ruthlessness and the futility of Pavlov's experiments on dogs, and through the lips of the "Black Girl" has asked the vital question :—

"How much better will the world be when it is all knowledge and no mercy?"

The Sixth Report of the Second Royal Commission contains this paragraph :—

British India. There is no legislation restricting Vivisection in British India. ...In the scientific institutes over which the Government has any control, the lines of the English Act are followed.

What a challenge and what an opportunity do these lines contain for the New India! The old India has possessed more than one Pasteur Institute—a "Temple of Science" where animal sacrifices take place in the name of Science. In 1939 a British anti-Vivisectionist made application to visit the Pasteur Institute at Shillong and was invited to tea! When she requested permission to see the animals, the reply of her host was "I can't show them to you."

Here is her description of what followed :—

"I walked straight out...and was just in time to see a couple of Indians hurrying away with two small cages. I called out in Hindustani "Stop, come here," and saw a wretched living rabbit in each cage, with a hole bored in each little head. I have never seen anything more terror-stricken than their eyes."

It is to be presumed that these creatures had been the victims of Pasteur's method of preparing anti-rabies serum for hydrophobia, by injecting the saliva of rabid dogs into the brains of rabbits.

A historic instance of blundering with disastrous consequences was dealt with towards the close of the Second Royal Commission by Sir George Kekewich, K.C.B., M.P., the Honorary Secretary of the Parliamentary Association for the Abolition of Vivisection, who spoke of

"the hopeless confusion and anomalies of present-day medical science."

Sir George went on to explain that the question of plague in India had come before his Association inasmuch as the serum used for the inoculations was prepared by the inoculation of animals. Cultures had been made at Abbasiek in Egypt from bacilli of bubonic plague obtained from Bombay, and inoculations tried on guinea-pigs, white rats, mice and horses. The witness said that thousands of animals had suffered in these experiments, and he proceeded to show what the result had been on the plague-stricken people of India.

The epidemic had lasted, not seven months, as was usually the case, but *ten years and seven months* (from September 1896 to the end of April, 1907), increasing in violence with every year till the number of deaths from plague had reached 5,325,000. He issued a challenge to a previous witness (Mr. C. J. Martin) to dare to say that without Haffkine's and Yersin's serums there would have been a higher total of deaths than five and a quarter million.

Sir George spoke of the "significant coincidence that never within the memory of man has plague been of such immensely long duration, and never within the memory of man has plague been treated by inoculations of plague serum." A duration of seven months was expected and predicted, but with the arrival of Dr. Yersin's serum, and others, "all hope of the epidemic keeping to its wonted period of activity was at an end. A manufacture of plague was established" and the deaths of millions as reported by Mr. Morley in the House of Commons on June 6th, 1907, was the result. In the *British Medical Journal*, June 15th, 1907, Dr. Rutherford showed that plague was one of the causes of unrest in India, that it was preventable, that it had been brought under control in most countries, and that only in India had it had such awful effects.

Sir George Kekewich pointed out further that an outbreak of plague had occurred at Alexandria in 1899, which was stamped out in seven months owing to the fact that a Commission sent previously by the Egyptian Government to Bombay had reported that "improved sanitation is the only method of staying the inroads of the disease." He concluded by stating that sanitary measures were directly opposed by Mr. Haffkine who was not a medical man and probably looked upon disease "from the laboratory point of view."

To look at disease "from the laboratory point of view" may, and often does, mean to look at it from the point of view of personal profit, personal ambition and vested interests. It is a recognized fact that these vast interests, taking the form of Government Departments, Committees, Councils, the Rockfeller Foundation, Pasteur Institutes and

the like, often maintained by grants from public funds, look at diseases throughout the world and in all countries "from a laboratory point of view" which, as it manufactured plague in India from 1896 to 1907, so now manufactures disease from the bodies of tortured creatures to multiply in the bodies of disease-ridden humanity.

It is greatly to be hoped that the New India, bearing these facts in mind, will for ever repudiate the greed, cruelty and ineptitude of the West. May medical men in the India of the future turn their backs upon the superstitions of a false and vicious science, based on the erroneous findings of a Jenner and the babblings of an impostor named Pasteur. May they renounce, as stupid and dangerous, the vaccinations, the inoculations, and, above all, the immoral Vivisection of the (so-called) scientific laboratories of Europe and America, which have made a travesty of the healing art. May the doctors of the New India draw their inspiration from their own ancient wisdom and from that system of preventive medicine in men and animals which goes today by the name of Nature Cure.

The challenge of Vivisection is a challenge to every moral and spiritual value hitherto realized by humanity. The hardening of the heart referred to by Shakespeare and continually mentioned before both Royal Commissions is an inevitable result of sacrificing the weak, the defenceless, the helpless, to the will of the strong. The spirit of the laboratory persists in the outside world and, given opportunity, produces the mental and physical conditions at Belsen, Dachau, Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Bikini. But it persists also in the Hospital, the Institution and the Mental Asylum, where patients sick unto death, friendless or orphan children, young babies and the afflicted in mind are used in ordinary daily life as "material" for scientific research.

Sir Henry Dale claimed this year (1947) at the British Association Meeting that science must be free and unrestricted. What then is to prevent the higher life of Mankind from being undermined by this dangerous ascendency of the mind over the heart and the soul? Only the realization by men, and by nations, that the principle of Love and Mercy—universally applied and embracing the whole realm of created beings—can save Humanity from direst calamity.

The *Sunday Express* of July 24th, 1927, published an article by the late H. G. Wells defending the practice of Vivisection, and on August 7th, 1927, the same newspaper printed a reply by George Bernard Shaw in which he declared:

> He (the Anti-Vivisector) does not say that physiologists must not seek knowledge and make experiments. He says that they must not seek knowledge by criminal methods.

Here is our answer to Sir Henry Dale and to those who maintain that anti-Vivisectionists are "ene-

mies of knowledge." Cornelius, the physician, replied to the Queen's suggestion that the effects of poisons should be tried upon animals by saying

> "Your Highness
> Shall from this practice but make hard your heart." (Cymbeline, I. 5)

And we know that he was right. We know, also, beyond doubt, that it is better for mankind to do without a scientific fact extorted from the suffering of any creature, than to lose its soul in the process.

E. WESTACOTT

ONE CLASS

In *Towards a Classless Society*, a Discussion Pamphlet" of the Fabian Society, Mr. H. D. Hughes, M. P., examines the ideals of social equality and economic democracy and the progress made towards them in Britain. By a graded tax incidence some progress has been made towards reducing income discrepancies. The professions and army commissions are no longer the preserve of the privileged classes to the same extent as before. A serious attempt has been made to democratise educational opportunity. And yet class distinctions are there, as caste is here in India, and must in some form persist because, for all the perversion and abuse of both, they rest on the undeniable fact that differences do exist and that all men are not equal in the development of the potentialities which all have in latency.

Mr. Hughes shies at the idea of "a new class structure based...upon real distinctions of intelligence and character" as "fundamentally anti-democratic." Not so, if hereditary transmission of a status which is purely individual is recognised as a fiction. Whatever the outward form of government it is of the first importance to secure its actual direction to those of highest character and intellect. It is for the sake of discovering and fostering the members of that natural aristocracy of individual development that the selective basis of educational opportunity is most important.

The retention of economic incentive while aiming at insuring the requirements of a happy and healthy life to all seems necessary at this stage and should not handicap the strengthening of the sense of social unity. But the time must come when even Mr. Herbert Morrison's recent idealistic declaration will need broadening in terms of a united world. Substitute "world" for "country" and then his statement, quoted by Mr. Hughes, is a true formula of universal brotherhood:—

> Every day we are beginning to realise more fully that our individual problem is no longer a struggle for a larger share in the wealth of the country, but a struggle to increase the total wealth of the country for the benefit of all.

PHILOSOPHY AND LIFE

I.—A STUDY IN CONTRASTED ATTITUDES

[**Mr. Melville Chaning-Pearce** analyses in this article, the first part of which we present here, two fundamentally opposed approaches to philosophy—those of the "Yogi" and the "Commissar," or of the mystic and the man of affairs.—ED.]

In his Autobiography Professor R. G. Collingwood said of the Oxford professors of the period between the two world wars that "they were proud to have excogitated a philosophy so pure from the sordid taint of utility that they could lay their hands upon their hearts and say that it was of no use at all." It was all too true; here was an open avowal of that betrayal of life by the learned which Julien Benda called the "*trahison des clercs.*" It is not surprising that the common man should return the compliment by ceasing to have any use for a philosophy which had no use for his life. It is an attitude toward philosophy, a divorce between thought and life, which is now very general. For the great majority of men and women philosophy has no relevance for the life they know and live. How far is that general judgment a just judgment?

It is one with which many, who in their own way were wise, have always been inclined to concur. "Do not all charms fly," asked John Keats, "at the mere touch of cold philosophy?" "Philosophy," he said, "will clip an Angel's wings." Much modern philosophy certainly does. "Hang up philosophy," says Romeo, that type of all lovers, "unless philosophy can make a Juliet." The philosophy with which we are familiar today seems very far from such a miracle.

For the average man and woman of affairs philosophy has always seemed an irrelevance for the real business of life. Their typical attitude was expressed in a classic form in the famous remark of a certain Mr. Edwards, "a decent-looking elderly man in grey clothes and a wig of many curls," so Boswell tells us, to Dr. Johnson, "You are a philosopher. I have tried too in my time to be a philosopher: but, I don't know how, cheerfulness was always breaking in."

Such is the common man's reaction to the pretensions of what he supposes philosophy to be. And most women, that more realistic sex, seem to share this sense of the irrelevance of philosophy for real life. At all events there are few who will not scout its findings if they conflict with those found in their own peculiar fashion. "A woman who is confuted is never convinced," said Churton Collins: it is a fact which most men will endorse.

This indifferent or antagonistic attitude towards philosophy, always prevalent among the "Philistine," "practical" mass of men and women, has been fomented in our day by a fashionable hatred of "high-brows" and the cult of the "common man" and, in more learned circles, by a tide of irrationalism which has swept through the universities of Europe and, with an odd irony, begotten an apparently anti-philosophical philosophy called existentialism.

Yet this much-abused business of philosophising has and always has had its no less zealous devotees. In Greece, whence all Western philosophy derives, it was the very crown of human achievement: the sages, lovers and pursuers of that elusive divinity, Sophia or Wisdom, were the most esteemed of men. For the mediæval world, the philosophy which flowered so luxuriantly and splendidly in such majesties of the human mind as the *Summa* of Saint Thomas Aquinas or the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, though the handmaid of faith, was yet the most regal of human enterprises. And even for that staunch anti-Romanist, John Milton, philosophy was not only a duty but a delight.

> How charming is divine philosophy:
> Not harsh and crabbed as dull fools suppose
> But musical as is Apollo's lute.

This is thus a matter upon which the mind of man is, and to some extent always has been, divided. But today this has become a division of consciousness, even, as the psychologists call it, a schizophrenia which is much more momentous than any mere academic issue. For we know now all too well that the disasters which have come upon us are directly due to some previous philosophising, that, for example, Hitlerism can be directly traced to philosophy such as that of Fichte and Nietzsche and Russian totalitarianism to such philosophers as Marx and Engels. Dachau and Belsen and the rape of Europe were born in the brains of apparently amiable philosophers. In face of that common knowledge the secluded paradise of a futile philosophy becomes, not a wise man's, but a fool's paradise. We have found that philosophy and behaviour are indissolubly linked; as we think, so we behave.

But the feud between philosophy and life has driven far more deeply into our modern life than the level of ideas alone. That feud is aflame in the world of action as well as of thought. For this antagonism between the man of thought and the man of action is precisely that conflict between what Mr. Koestler has called the "Yogi" and the "Commissar" types, which, he has shown, threatens the very existence of Western civilisation. For the Commissar philosophy, in any real or original sense of the unbiassed pursuit of Truth for its own sake, together with all contemplation and mysticism, is "anathema"—an antisocial activity to be eradicated root and branch. For the Commissar, to

quote that terrible book, *Darkness at Noon*—" Truth is what is useful to humanity, falsehood is what is hurtful." Therefore all who seek or tell the naked truth must be ruthlessly liquidated; all real philosophy is "Public Enemy No. I." Thus a philosophy too pure and proud to be of use is confronted by a pseudo-philosophy for which truth becomes no more than the tool of power-politics.

That doctrine, as fatal for human freedom as for philosophy, is now not only being thought and taught; it is being practised upon a scale so vast and appalling that the mind shrinks from confronting the facts. While we watch and discuss, philosophy and Truth are being systematically murdered. If that process continues it seems all too probable that, in a generation, not only philosophy (in any real sense of the word), but also our very civilisation, rooted, as it is, in a certain perennial philosophy or life-attitude, will be eradicated from the Western world. This, then, is no matter for detached and debonair discussion.

But one has only to think clearly to realise that this pogrom against philosophy is itself, in reality, founded upon a philosophy—the philosophy which affirms that individual man is a myth, that only the State is real, that only what is called "material substance" exists and that all truth is relative. The horrifying spectacle which we behold is thus that of philosophy devouring itself as, in one of the most macabre passages of *Paradise Lost*, Sin sits at the gates of Chaos and is violated by her own offspring for ever.

This philosophy which persecutes all philosophy and must therefore, in the end, destroy itself, is either a true or a false philosophy, and the "fell clutch of circumstance" as well as the claims of our own inner integrity compel us today to make our choice and take our stand. It is this realisation which recently impelled a distinguished scientist, Michael Polanyi, to declare that "the most urgent need of the day is to oppose this philosophy (of materialism) with all our might." But if it is to be opposed it can only be opposed in the name of a true philosophy. Of so much relevance, then, is this problem of the nature and function of philosophy for our life.

We are driven to a search of the foundations of philosophy in order to find a yardstick with which to measure this materialistic philosophy which thus threatens our very life. When we do so we are confronted with two opposite conceptions concerning the very nature of philosophy. By derivation and tradition, philosophy is the wooing of Wisdom. But where is Wisdom to be found? For the Commissar it is only in humanity, Man writ large, that, not Truth, but a truth made to man's measure, is to be found. For the secular humanist also there is no Wisdom beyond the range of human knowledge or "Science."

On the other hand, and in sharp distinction from that dogma of secular humanism, we find that all the "high religions" of the world, very many of its philosophies and the most eminent of its men of genius assume a quite different dogma—that Wisdom is to be found ultimately only beyond human wit or, in the words of a pithy proverb, "at wit's end."

Thus philosophy, when scrutinised, immediately divides into two categories which, in technical terms, may be called a philosophy of immanence, assuming that Wisdom is limited to human knowledge, and a philosophy of transcendence, assuming a Wisdom which exceeds or transcends the mind of mortal man. These are the fundamental dogmas (for neither of them can be proved by logic) between which, at the very outset of our enquiry, it is evident that we must make our choice.

MELVILLE CHANING-PEARCE

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Can there be cultivated callousness to animal suffering on the part of the few, and a readiness on the part of many to profit by the exploitation of helpless creatures, and the natural sympathy of man for man be unaffected? The horrible excesses of the last war, coming in the wake of long decades of slaughter, trapping, vivisection, give the answer—No.

Even unthinking cruelty, while it does not inevitably cause a bifurcation of the consciousness, afflicts its victims no less painfully and must react upon its perpetrators. The men and women of the modern world eat meat, wear furs, use serums, without a notion of incurring thereby responsibility for the suffering of the helpless animals involved. It is well that this note of responsibility is struck in this year's call for the observance of World Day for Animals on October 4th, when all are urged to "Think—Speak—Act for Suffering Animals." The publicity material of the World League Against Vivisection and For Protection of Animals brings out the pressing need, in the interest of harmony and peace, of leading humanity towards humaneness.

> For a mighty power, which no man can evade, rules this universe. It is the power of Immutable Law. Cruelty begets cruel pain.

The followers of Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism, which rest four-square upon the unity of life, should be ready to lend their full co-operation to this move emanating from the professedly Christian West. The sooner all awaken to the fallacy of the lower kingdoms' existing solely for man's will and pleasure, the better for humanity and for the world. For truly, as Bacon said, "The nobler a man is, the more objects of compassion he hath."

TOLERANCE PAYS

[It is a sign of our times, and one which heartens all in a world where forces of hate are at work, that religious preachers of broad sympathies advocate respect and appreciation of religions other than their own. **Rabbi Morris A. Skop**, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association of Florida Rabbis, makes such a plea in the following essay.—ED.]

People everywhere are beginning to realise the challenge of the Atomic Age—that " mankind must learn to live together or they will perforce die together. " In spite of marvellous scientific advances, there has not been a corresponding advance in social relationships between peoples. Prejudice, bigotry, hatred and misunderstanding still haunt the masses. These dark forces stand in the way of that universal dream, " One World and One Humanity. " Living in " One World " cannot mean forcing people to live in " one way. " Variety is part of the warp and woof of life and despite their differences men must learn to live in brotherhood.

Tolerance pays great dividends in interest and happiness. We must but grasp the keys to tolerance: " Know thyself " and " Get to know the other fellow. " Learn to appreciate his way of life, although it differs from your own. Understand that your fellow-man differs from you for many reasons—heredity, geography, customs and religious teachings. Getting to know the " other fellow " leads to tolerance and a deep appreciation which pays in a richer experience of life. Religions may preach " love thy neighbour " for centuries, but until each is willing to " get to know the other fellow " such teachings will bring no fruition.

Tolerance and understanding enrich human life, enlighten the mind and lead to a deeper regard for one's own faith. When I was a lad of thirteen, I had been taught only the beauties of the Hebrew faith. I read only Hebrew and Jewish books. My entire life revolved about Jewish customs and ceremonies. All I studied was the history of my own country, America, and of the Jewish people. When I went to the university, I learned that there were people who had never heard of the things I believed nor of the interesting teachings of the Jewish faith. I had never heard of their faith. I became fascinated with other people. I met a Hindu at the International House in New York and became anxious to know more of his life, his beliefs, his background. At first I thought him strange and different, even inferior. Had I shied away, my own life would have been robbed of a stimulating and beautiful experience. Instead, I began to read about the Hindu faith, I took courses in Comparative Religion and learned, wide-eyed, that there were other

faiths besides Judaism, that had different symbols, ceremonies and teachings, but also led to the "good life."

I had thought that only Jews who lived according to the Torah would live the best lives. But after meeting other peoples and studying other religions, I became more tolerant. And with this wider toleration for others who differed from me, who lived differently and dressed differently and ate different foods, my own life became richer in appreciation of my fellow-men. Tolerance began to pay dividends in greater happiness. I was unafraid of meeting persons who looked or thought differently. I began to realize that, no matter how strangely different people lived, they had common problems.

I had learned a great lesson—that behind the differing prayers, symbols and customs, there were the same heart-yearnings, the same human problems.

This opened new vistas for me. I was anxious to meet many not of my faith and background. Gradually, the prejudices of race, colour and faith died away. I began to treat human beings as "brothers under the skin." I began to realize how utterly hypocritical was talk of Universal Peace and Brotherhood while hating Negroes, misunderstanding the yellow man, seeing the wide-spread hatred of the Jew. It was then that I began to interest myself in Inter-Cultural and Inter-Faith work. It dawned upon me that no religion is worthy of its profession, if it produces followers "colour-blind" or race-bigoted. As a teacher of religion, I began to insist that "Tolerance pays."

Tolerance in its deeper sense of appreciation of the other fellow became an axiom for decent living in the Atomic Age. I could see how true tolerance enriched my own life; gave me an *entrée* to new worlds of differing peoples, as fine, intelligent and good in their way as I was, living as a Jew.

The more I studied other religions —Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, Christianity, Mohammedanism—the more I realized that, although these faiths differed in theology, ethics, world outlook, there was a thread of humane teaching common to them all. I appreciated more deeply the humane outlook of my own faith. I became convinced that if peoples were to live by their own faiths and practise their teachings, they must be tolerant of others who differ from them. An honest Jew can never profess Judaism and hate his fellow-man. He can differ, but he cannot be intolerant. The same is true of a loyal Christian. The fundamental teaching of Christianity is "love of fellow-men." Then how can a loyal Christian hate a Jew or treat the Negro as an inferior being? There is a serious inconsistency in such a life. Having lived in the South of the United States, among many professing Christians, I have learned how deep is this inconsistency which warps many otherwise good lives.

This irrational belief by professing Christians in "White supremacy" breeds terrible intolerance which gnaws at the vitals of Democracy. We have seen what belief in "racial supremacy" brought about in Nazi Germany. We have seen what tragic misunderstanding has grown up about the Jews being "the Chosen People." There are no superior races biologically. Peoples are inferior or superior only in actions and culture based on their standards of civilization.

Similarly, faiths "best" for their adherents are not necessarily the best for all. As soon as persons begin to insist that they are, the seed of intolerance is planted. When one lives up to his own faith, and seeks to understand the faiths of others, tolerance and understanding enrich and beautify. The more I studied other religions and the ways of life of other peoples, the more I appreciated my own faith.

It is wrong for any race or any religion to claim superiority. The ultimate test of any faith is what it produces. If its adherents become intolerant, prejudiced and filled with hatred of other human beings, such a religion has no place in the Atomic Age. If a faith produces adherents tolerant and understanding, filled with the "love of fellow-men," then such a faith will help usher in the Kingdom of God on Earth, and the Brotherhood of Man which will give us Universal Peace.

I suggest the following additions to the Ten Commandments as basic to our civilization:

11. Remember the commandments "Love thy neighbour" and "Do not unto others what you would not have others do unto you."
12. Thou shalt not kill the reputations of decent people with hatred, falsehood and misunderstanding.
13. Thou shalt not steal the bread of the wage-earner by refusing him work because of his race, colour or creed.
14. Thou shalt not bear false witness against a group because of the vices of one of its members.
15. Thou shalt not commit the crime of Intolerance by teaching that thy faith is the best for all mankind, but realize with tolerance that all faiths, all peoples have a way of life which can lead them to Human Brotherhood.

MORRIS A. SKOP

THOUGHTS ON TWO OF SHELLEY'S POEMS

[**Shri B. N. Shama Rao,** who is a Lecturer in English at the College in Shimoga, Mysore State, essays in this short article an appraisal—personal, poetic and philosophic—of two of Shelley's great poems, "Adonais" and "Ode to the West Wind." The former stresses the faith of the poet that "the genius who makes loveliness more lovely on earth, is in itself essentially deathless and becomes united with the One that sustains life and endures for ever," while the latter dwells on that One's being both a Destroyer and a Preserver and closes on the assurance, "If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?"—ED.]

All sublime poetry is an inspired and artistic revelation of the personality of the poet. This is true even of dramatic and epic poetry, but in the lyric we come closest to the soul-life of the author. Shelley conceived of poetry as nothing short of the record of the happiest and best moments of the noblest of souls. He claimed for the poet the rank of the unacknowledged legislator of the world. Poetry was to him the redemption from decay of the visitations of the divinity in man. His own poetry, therefore, is not "the beating in the void his luminous wings in vain" of "a beautiful but ineffectual angel," but the passionate pouring forth of the soul melody of an inspired and inspiring angel.

Shelley died very young, in his thirtieth year, surviving Keats by little more than a year. But in his brief earthly existence Shelley passed through spiritual agonies and ecstasies ordinarily denied to persons living twice as long. Burning with a holy passion to rebuild the world on the foundations of Love and Tolerance, Shelley adored intellectual beauty all through his life and condemned most vigorously the widespread tyranny of priest and king. Naturally, because of his advanced views and his zeal for reform, he came into violent conflict with society, established as it was on the love of property and on the principle of self. The malady of selfishness and thoughtless cruelty which had affected a decadent society filled the poet with sadness as he contemplated it in divine discontent. Like the moth which aspires to the star, or like the night which endlessly pursues the dawn, the poet throughout his brief life pursued a glistening but receding ideal. The pursuit itself was to his soul joy ineffable. But thought bestowed on the world as he saw it around him filled him with dismay. This conflict in his life he was never able to resolve. Death delivered him from the agony of it.

His noble lament on the premature death of Keats, therefore, is more a self-revelation by the ethereal spirit than a dirge for the young poet who died singing of the identity of Beauty and Truth. Though cast in the pastoral vein and therefore

containing the usual address to heavenly powers, the sorrow of Nature personified and the long procession of mourners for the dead, "Adonais" is truly an autobiography of Shelley and a record of his inspired conviction as regards the immortality of the soul of the virtuous dead. The faith of the poet that the genius who makes loveliness more lovely while on earth, is in himself essentially deathless and becomes united with the One that sustains life and endures for ever, is eloquently set forth in the famous final stanzas of the elegy.

Here one can clearly see the influence on Shelley of the idealistic thought of Plato. To him death appears to be actually an awakening into a world of enhanced light and enlarged freedom. While Earth's shadows fly and Death tramples to fragments the many-coloured glass of life, Heaven's light forever shines and the many are seen to lose themselves in the One. This philosophic faith, bred by contemplation on the mystery of death and the premature disappearance of beauty and creative energy from the world were nursed in Shelley by his persistent study of Plato. More than any other single poem of modern times "Adonais" is a record of this saving philosophic faith of the ancient Greek sage.

But this is not all the appeal of "Adonais" to the thoughtful student of poetry. In this poem, while giving an account of the many gentle shepherds (sensitive poets) who come to shed their tears as mourners over their fellow shepherd, prematurely called away from their midst, Shelley indulges in inspired self-pity. These are some of the most touching lines in English poetry and bring home to us the childlike simplicity and the angelic purity of Shelley's soul. He describes himself as a frail form, a phantom among men. In the world around him, built on greed and power, he is companionless like the last cloud of an expiring storm. He seems to have been strangely punished for gazing on Nature's naked loveliness, Actæon-like. He is pursued, like Actæon, by the hounds of his own thoughts over the wilderness of the world. He is a pard-like spirit, beautiful and swift—a Love in desolation masked. He is a Power girt round with weakness. Hardly can he lift the weight of the superincumbent hour. He is a dying lamp, a falling shower, a breaking billow, a withering flower. His burning cheek hides a breaking heart within. Flowers the most sad are appropriate decorations to his burning brow. The pansy, the faded violet, the dark ivy-tresses rightly adorn his person as he comes in the procession of mourners over the dead as the very last, neglected and apart, even like a herd-abandoned deer struck by the hunter's dart. His very presence silences the rest as they gaze on his woe-begone visage which is very much like Cain's or Christ's, and seems to proclaim to the world that in mourn-

ing over the fate of "Adonais" this sad poet is mourning his own impending doom.

All this is poetry pure and simple, a spontaneous overflow of a sadly afflicted soul wandering as a stranger in a wicked world of wealth and power, now feeling most desolate, again rising with inspired eloquence to reshape things nearer his heart's desire, panting for perfection, sighing for Love and singing of undying hope.

It is the same passionate fervour of divine melancholy and energetic despair which we find in his magnificent Ode addressed to the West Wind. The wild energy of the West Wind, the breath of Autumn's Being, makes the poet recapitulate the work of pitiless havoc done by the wind amidst the dead leaves of the forest, driven like ghosts before an enchanter. At the same time he remembers how the same destroying power of the wind sows in the bosom of the earth seeds which will later rise in the shape of buds and blossoms when the gentle winds of spring shall blow. To him the wind of the west, therefore, is both a Destroyer and a Preserver. He pictures to himself again the commotion in the sky among the clouds as the wind blows and scatters them over the seas, turning the sky itself into a vast sepulchre to the clouds despoiled of their moisture. He can hear in the blowing wind the dirge of the dying year. He can again clearly fancy the turmoil in the sea caused by the powerful wind, as it raises waves so high now and again as to show the very floor of the ocean with all its hidden treasure. He can vividly see the mighty Atlantic cloven in two to make a pathway for the blowing wind of the west. Then suddenly turning his vision inwards, and finding in himself nothing but despair, he appeals to the wind to lift him as a cloud, a wave, a leaf. For he has lived beyond the light and joyous years of boyhood. He has fallen upon "the thorns of life!" He bleeds.

> A heavy weight of hours has chained and bowed
> One too like thee [the wind]; tameless and swift and proud.

He begs that he might be made a lyre to the wind even as the forest is, so that a sweet and sad harmony might be born of him. He desires that he might be made one with the wind, so that his dead thoughts, like the seeds scattered by the wind, might be borne afar to quicken a new birth. He desires that with the incantation of his verse his thoughts may be scattered among mankind and be to unawakened earth the trumpet of a prophecy. He feels assured, as he contemplates the energy of the Destroyer and Preserver, that "if Winter comes," Spring cannot "be far behind."

This inspired Ode, like the elegiac poem on Keats, is a passionate and poetic record of the spiritual agony of this ethereal poet as he groped his way, a stranger in a sordid world ruled by crazy kings and perverse priests, all the time praying for the

Light which to him was Love, to illuminate his path and lead him on to serenity and peace. Shelley was nothing if not lyrical. It is his noble personality which we meet with in every one of his magnificent poems, which are among the greatest in the literature of a country justly proud of her poets.

B. N. SHAMA RAO

THE BASIS FOR THE MORAL LAW

"Among the principal causes of human miseries and disasters has always been the pursuit of vain imaginings," says Viscount Samuel in the Romanes Lecture which he delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre on 2nd May 1947 and which has since been published under the caption of *Creative Man*. And by these "vain imaginings" he implies what he calls figments and fictions, both good and bad, of philosophy, politics and religion—offspring of "that strange faculty of imagination." While disagreeing with this thesis of his we are in entire agreement with him in this desire to get rid of the harmful figments. This could be done by rules of right action. For "the creativity of man culminates in the Moral Law." This moral law is evolved out of the elementary proposition, he opines, that men in general desire their own welfare—which is a whole, built up from many interconnected elements, physical, intellectual, emotional and spiritual.

Is there, however, a fundamental basis for this moral law? The eminent philosopher seems to doubt as well as deny such a "firm foundation for belief and for conduct." As he says, it is "in the lack of it that many moderns have fallen back on instinct and intuition." And yet there exists what is known as Wisdom-Religion or Perennial Philosophy or what the author of *The Friendly Philosopher* calls "universal perception" or "universal existence," which furnishes the needed foundation for all true morality; namely, the motive of selfless service to humanity, or Self-activating altruism.

Further, incidentally it may be mentioned that myths, truly speaking, are as different from fictions and figments as ideals are from idols. For they are archetypal values, only veiled in the apparel of luminous imagination which therefore is not a strange but a divine faculty.

It is another matter if this foundational basis of right conduct is not followed by a large majority of people. But it is there in the heart of man. Perhaps he will come to a consciousness of it when the same creativity in him which has culminated at the present stage in the Moral Law, is eventually consummated in the Spiritual Law. But, as the Viscount says, "the question is whether our will can rise to match our opportunity."

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

The Stamp of Nature: A Study of Parental and Family Influences. By DALLAS KENMARE. (Williams and Norgate, Ltd., London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

In this penetrating study of one aspect of human enslavement Miss Dallas Kenmare combines, as in her earlier book, *The Philosophy of Love*, a devotion to religious values and a conviction that only through them can unregenerate man find personal freedom, with a sensitive and informed psychological insight. She is concerned primarily with the relations of parents and children and particularly with the fate of the sensitive child, and not only with the child but with the artist battling against the misunderstanding of the world. Her view of the artist as "divine messenger and/or prophet" is true enough of a certain kind of genius. But not all artists are of this Promethean kind. And she tends to overlook the kind of artist who makes and contemplates, and who, possibly because he is humbler, can adapt himself better to human limitations. But within the scope of her definition she reveals a passionate understanding of the artist's peculiar sufferings during earthly life, above all of his sense of "being born with a different face" and of the injuries which the ignorant and ordinary can inflict upon him, particularly in his early years.

One part of her book, entitled "The End Is Madness," illustrates this truth in the life-stories of Ruskin, Kierkegaard, D. H. Lawrence, Nietzsche, Holderlin and Schumann. A subsequent chapter contains a number of cases of disastrous parental interference which have come within her own experience. Not all her examples end in death, insanity or frustration. But the record of emotional blackmail or psychological murder, inflicted by possessive relatives who believed that they were acting for the best, is grim enough. Most of them were drawn from the professional and commercial middle class in which the ethics of acquisitive individualism and consequent insensitiveness to all that art and the artist mean were most pronounced.

Today, perhaps, the child has less cause to weep over its parents than in the time of Mr. Moulton Barrett or even a generation ago. But if little remains of the authoritarian family to torture and mutilate human personality, the torturing and mutilation go on through other agencies and will continue, as Miss Kenmare so movingly insists, until the divine nature of personality is recognised and reverenced. Her book is in essence a sustained plea for this recognition in the light of a "pure Christianity" to which possessive love and the idea of "rights" over human beings is as alien as the contemporary identification of love with sex. The conviction with which she writes, even if at times it leads to rather too downright assertions, is compellingly human.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa. By DEVENDRAKUMAR RAJARAM PATIL, M.A., LL.B., PH. D. (Deccan College Dissertation Series No. 2, Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, Poona 1. Rs. 15/-)

Among the literary records of ancient India the Puranas form a rich source of information and they have not been explored fully yet. They are very valuable for the political, dynastic and cultural history of ancient India. The reviewer took up for investigation five major Puranas with a view to getting light on these three aspects of ancient history and three pamphlets including one on the Lalitha Cult, written by the reviewer, were published by the University of Madras in their historical series.

The author of the present book has done well to seek the cultural history of ancient India in the *Vāyu Purāṇa* for it is generally accepted as the oldest Purana extant. He speaks of three important materials, *viz.*, the archaic survivals, the ancient material and the accretions, which constitute the Purana. A brief outline of political history as found in the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is given in the introduction.

The book is divided into two parts, containing ten parallel chapters. Chapter I in both parts has the same title, and so on. The author examines in the first chapter on "Social Organisation" the position of the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas. Incidentally the relations between them are also traced. It cannot be accepted that the Dasyus were the aborigines of India. There is no justification in the text for accepting the absence of any prohibition of eating beef. The chapters on "Woman and Marriage" call for no observation; but it may be noted that the practice of *Niyoga* was a relic of the ancient past. The third chapter, on "Political Institutions" is interesting. Though hereditary succession was the rule, the election of a king was also in vogue. Among the popular institutions, *Samithi*, *Sabha* and *Gana* are mentioned. Worship of Siva is important and the myths about that god are striking. In fact the Yogin is advised to know Mahesvara and achieve final beatitude. The section on Vaishnavism is rather disappointing. The avatars are not properly explained.

The system of chronology chalked out in Part II is meagre. The author has given a descriptive account of the villages and towns mentioned in the Puranas with their distances. The chapters on "Dress and Ornaments, Food and Drink," as also those on "Music and Dancing" are satisfactory. War and weapons are dismissed in a few pages while the fauna and flora have been examined in detail. There are two appendices, the first, which is fairly long, on the identification of place names, tribes and geographical names and the other on places of pilgrimage. On the whole the book gives a scientific and analytical account and is a good addition to books on Indian culture.

V. R. R. DIKSHITAR

The Indian War of Independence, 1857. By VINAYAK DAMODAR SAVARKAR. Illustrated. (Phoenix Publications, Bombay 2. Rs. 15/-)

This book was first issued in London in 1909 and was forthwith banned by Authority so that, even decades after, the copy at the British Museum could

not be borrowed, I remember, except by special permission. The lifting of the local ban by the Congress Government of Bombay has made the present issue possible.

That the "Sepoy Mutiny" was, in its deeper aspect, a war of national independence, is no longer a matter of doubt save in the wish-thoughts of old-school historians. Shri Savarkar's work is of immense popular appeal. His writing is forceful and vivid, and lit up with imaginative power. The story seems to tell itself. The great figures of the time come warmly to life: Nana-Saheb, Rani Lakshmi Bai, Moulvi Ahmad Shah, Tatia Topé and a host of lesser people who made "1857" possible. One wishes, though, that sweeping statements were supported by reference to source material. That is an unfortunate omission.

This work, even if built on a framework of facts, is far from a calm, detached account. Charged with passion, it was primarily designed to kindle passion. It was incendiary material prepared for the *Abhi Nava Bharat* Revolutionary Society, and secretly handed out, and so it served the purpose of the freedom struggle in the teens of the current century before Mahatmaji gave that struggle an altogether new direction, with a new ideology. The propagandist passages in the book have shed their fire today because of the snapping of imperialist chains. Such passages could well have been cut from the present edition and the material recast as pure history, unless it is meant to be the writer's psychological revelation of himself and the movement he so boldly led.

It is, I think, a mistake to read too much significance into "1857." India was then divided against herself. India had not then discovered herself. Blind forces, often at cross-purposes, bestrode the stage with elemental fury. It is futile to deny the fact, cruel as it is, that Britain's occupation of India, often painful, often regressive, served yet a dynamic purpose. (Karl Marx noted this.) The nineteenth-century Battle of Britain, resulting in the dominance of finance capital and the final break-up of feudalism, made its strong impress, through close contact, upon developing Indian economy. This process would surely have been slowed down if "1857" had triumphed and all power had gone to a feudal-military oligarchy, so many sad relics of which persist.

A word on the get-up of this book. The paper and type face, the rich colour plates and the scores of decorations make it a unique production.

BHABANI BHATTACHARYA

Sphoṭavāda by Nagesa Bhatta. Edited by VYAKARANASIROMANI V. KRISHNAMACHARYA with his own Commentary *Subodhinī*. (Adyar Library Series No. 55, Adyar Library, Adyar, Madras. Rs. 3/12)

All students of Sanskrit grammar will welcome this nice edition of the *Sphoṭavāda* by Nagesa Bhatta, who lived at Benares towards the close of the seventeenth century. In the present treatise this celebrated philosopher and grammarian has expounded the teaching of the Sage Sphoṭāyana, the traditional formulator of the theory of *Sphoṭa*. This theory attempts to link up the transient phenomenon of the pronounced word to Brahman as *Śabda-*

Brahman, which is the eternal Noumenon of every form of significant sound or word. This theory is similar to the Platonic theory of the Logos (Word) and reminds one of the saying in the Christian scriptures: "In the beginning was the Word (Logos); the word was with God; and the *Word was God*," as observed by Dr. Murti in his learned Preface. The Word, called *Sphoṭa* is without parts and eternal. From it comes the whole creation of the world with all its manifested objects. From this stand-point, Sanskrit grammar becomes not merely a science of linguistics or the art of correct speaking or writing, but a philosophy with its own metaphysics. In fact, one who is well versed in *Śabda-Brahman* (the permanent Noumenon) attains to the Supreme Brahman. In this way Sanskrit Grammar becomes the science of Liberation (*mokṣa-śāstra*).

There are four stages in the transition of the eternal *Sphoṭa* or *Śabda-Brahman* to the form of the spoken word or sound. These are called (1) *Parā*; (2) *Paśyantī*, (3) *Madhyamā* and (4) *Vaikhārī*. The Editor has dealt with the explanation of these and other details of the theory of *Sphoṭa* in his elaborate and scholarly Sanskrit Introduction of 31 pages, as also in his lucid commentary in Sanskrit called *Subodhinī* which accompanies the text. The present text deserves to be studied by all students of Sanskrit grammar, which is considered by our University students a dry-as-dust subject. In spite of the comparative neglect of Sanskrit grammar in our Universities, however, this unattractive but essential science has been kept alive by erudite scholars like the present editor. The study of abstract sciences like grammar is not an easy task. It is, therefore, highly creditable to Pandit Krishnamacharya that he should pursue this study for its own sake and give us the fruit of his selfless study in publications like this, which is a valuable addition to the Adyar Library Series.

P. K. GODE

Thirty Years of Historical Research, or Bibliography of the Published Writings of P. K. GODE, M.A. (Author, Curator, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. Rs. 3/-)

This third edition of Professor Gode's *Bibliography* brings the list up to 1946; it gives an account of 134 more papers since the second edition appeared in 1941, making a total of 336 papers of original research by Professor Gode. It covers thirty years of indefatigable research carried on with single-minded devotion to the cause of truth. The astonishing variety of the topics dealt with, and the minuteness and accuracy of the research, testified to by various Indologists, take one's breath away. The topics cover several interesting byways of historical, linguistic and literary study.

The major portion of the publication consists of the opinions of leading scholars of West and East on various papers of Professor Gode. The bibliography as such occupies only 39 pages. The old and new prefaces and forewords make interesting reading and give the reader an idea of the genesis of Professor Gode's research. It would be a fitting tribute to the learned scholar's lifelong work if a board of scholars could be constituted to make a selection from his numerous papers and bring

out a collected edition of the important contributions of Professor Gode for his sixtieth year (1951). The versatility and accuracy of Professor Gode's research of over thirty years require permanent recognition, as pointed out by Prof. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar in his learned and informative foreword to this Edition.

D. GURUMURTI

The Indian Concept of the Beautiful. By DEWAN BAHADUR K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, with a Foreword By SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR. (Travancore University Series No. 5, The University, Trivandrum.)

The Travancore University has rendered a distinct service to current studies of Indian æsthetics by offering these lectures by Dewan Bahadur Ramaswami Sastri to the public. The author is well known for his wide erudition and catholic taste in Sanskrit literature in general and æsthetics in particular. This present effort of his gives in simple outline the central features of Indian art in all its departments of architecture, sculpture, iconography, painting, music and poetry. The pioneer work of European investigators such as Fergusson, Havell and Brown is assimilated but there is effort to correct their inadequacies and prejudices. The author is successful in suggesting that there is a single comprehensive vision of life in Indian art, expressing itself in varied forms. Six lectures are devoted to a delineation (though in outline) of these central features.

Mr. Sastri does full justice to the classical work of Bharata in his *Natya Sastra* in crystallising Indian theory and practice by his chiselled *sutra*-like aphorisms and definitive verses. These statements of Bharata's have not merely laid the foundations of Indian æsthetics but also have given a direction to centuries of thought, analysis and constructive effort in art and literary criticism. The author illustrates this pre-eminent position of Bharata by the rôle played by his master *sutra* in the interpretation of æsthetic experience and the suggestion of art forms. This basic text, *viz.*, *vibhāva-anubhāva-vyabhichāri-samyogāth-rasa-nishpatthih*, expounds the nature of *rasa* or æsthetic joy. It means that æsthetic joy is born of the union of a specific stimulus with a major emotion, its physical expressions and derived feelings all represented in an appropriate synthesis.

The learned author gives an attractive survey of the principal arts of India in the light of this central theory. He stresses the rôle of the philosophic intuitions of India in shaping her æsthetic experience and art forms. *Rasa* or æsthetic joy is seen as an analogue of Ānanda or the cosmic joy subsisting at the heart of the universe. But metaphysics does not swamp the *objective* presentation of the fields of art so as to obscure their distinctive contours. The principal representative works of Indian masters in all these fields are mentioned briefly so that the reader obtains an idea of the extensiveness of the Indian effort in this direction through the centuries. In architecture he combats the foreigner's theories of multiple inspiration for Indian styles, Buddhistic, Jain, Greek in Gandhara, etc. In sculpture and iconography he points to the significance of *yogic* practice as explain-

ing the unique forms of Indian figures. It was not verisimilitude in the sense of fidelity to outer appearance that was aimed at but truth to the soul of the object as revealed in spiritual contemplation that accounts for the individuality of Indian art forms. Similarly in drama, painting and poetry, the author is full of suggestive ideas offering the right orientation to a fresh study of this fascinating branch of Indian culture. It may be that students accustomed to expect rigour of thought and closeness of analysis may not appreciate the luxuriousness of diction and the fondness for cloying epithets characterising the author's language. But for a first approach and introduction to the main themes of Indian æsthetics, freed from the distortion and superior tone of foreign scholars on the subject, the work under review is sure to perform a useful service for years to come.

M. A. VENKATA RAO

The Poetic Image. By C. DAY LEWIS. (Jonathan Cape, London. 8*s*. 6*d*.)

This is a sensitive and discriminating study, written with a satisfying balance between imaginativeness and commonsense. Its only limitation is not one which attaches to the gifted performance of its author, but which derives from a situation of the most general type: what may be described as the philosophical background of conventional literary thought.

I am reviewing this book in THE ARYAN PATH, a journal devoted to exploring and interpreting the teachings of the Ancient Wisdom. It is only appropriate, therefore, to consider Mr. Lewis's essay from this particular angle of thought. And to do so is to be met immediately with the basic problem of *where literature stops*—or, more precisely, the respects in which an exclusively literary culture fails us through being insufficiently fertilized and oriented by more ultimate values. The criticism is justifiably brought against science that it constitutes a closed system of concepts. But even poetic thought is in some measure a closed system in so far as it is concerned with processes the deeper keys to which are revealed only in the realms of esoteric knowledge. To put it plainly, we have to consider the possibility that the poet's realizations represent only an anticipatory order of vision. Behind his images lie arcane symbols to which the hierophant has more direct access.

Mr. Lewis takes, it is true, a few cautious steps in this direction, but finding himself in the jungle of Jungian psychology wisely withdraws. But the challenge remains: Is the poet responding emotionally to that which can be known with more directness and certainty by an authentic initiation into the Mysteries? Such an attainment is as rare, of course, as that entailed in supreme artistic achievement. But the essential point is that a great deal depends upon how far men are *consciously* turning to the Gnosis as a source of illumination. Mr. Lewis's otherwise admirable essay is characteristic of a culture in which contact with the Spirit is sought almost entirely through the medium of physical experience. The fruits are considerable; but it may well prove that the final word is with those who turn also directly to the great Unseen for light.

L. H.

Politics and Ethics. By GRETA HERMANN. First Indian Edition. (The National Information and Publications, Ltd., National House, Bombay. Rs. 2/8)

The author, after tracing the causes of the economic and political catastrophes of our times to "industry and inventiveness, which have almost exclusively been used as a means to study and control the forces of Nature and Society," and the various empirical and sociological palliatives tried to overcome them, pleads for a consideration of ethical questions *vis-à-vis* political aims and activities "with the same careful attention as modern scientists apply in their own province," and even for taking office, for, as Confucius said, "It is by taking office that the noble do 'their duty.'" This will clarify and confirm periodically the ethical convictions of the people, thereby bringing a sense of visions and values actively to bear upon scientific research or technology on the one hand and the causal relationship between objectives and events on the other. Thus there will come about "the true union of human morals and enlightened human politics," to quote Dr. Benes's address in London at the 1941 session of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

The book is stimulating though its scope is limited mainly to the treatment—both logical and luminous—of ethical principles and less to the application of these to the evolving social relations and forces and to the urges, impulses, interests and instinct for expediency obtaining generally in the individual.

Politics and Ethics is a kind of a commentary on the Platonic dictum: Philosophers must be Kings and Kings, Philosophers.

G. M.

The Stones of the Field. By R. S. THOMAS. (The Druid Press, Ltd., Carmarthen. 6*s*.)

These poems "seek to re-affirm man's affinities with the age-old realities of stone, field and tree," and indeed they use effectively the technique of fusing and confusing the forms of man and nature—the labourer, gnarled, inarticulate, almost an outcrop of the harsh mountain land he tends; the lean acre of man's body with terraces of bone and barren blood stream, while earth and trees are personalized by metaphors drawn from animal and human forms.

It is said the imagery is akin to that of early Welsh writers, and some of the shorter poems are reminiscent of delicately delineated Chinese word-poems—"Frost," "Cyclamen," "The Question," "Country Church," and "Summer Evening" being some of the most attractive. But though there seems a hint of something beyond, the level of the poems is not that of true spiritual mysticism, but rather that of the protean, psychic, dream plane. Beauty it may have of its kind, but its bitter-sweet sensibility is no true substitute for the vision of Spirit that sees the Real even through the ever-shifting forms of the unreal. Pantheism does not mean that every stone and tree in nature is God. That is fetish-worship. The eternal, uncreate Nature is one with Deity, not the "aggregate of flitting shadows and finite unrealities." Man's soul must not stoop to lose itself in this illusion. It must raise the soul in Nature to its own divine level. Then the image-making faculty of the poet will be rooted, not in phantasy, but in truth.

E. W.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE LIMITATIONS OF NON-VIOLENCE"

The essay on "The Limitations of Non-Violence" in the August number of THE ARYAN PATH which is intended to clear "some confusion of thought, in respect of both religion and politics" introduced by the "exaltation of the principle of non-violence," appears to me to have some serious philosophical limitations. Between Philosophy, or Religion, as the case may be, and politics there is a relation and the principle of that relation seems to me to be found in the utterance: *Yad Yad ācharathi śrèstāh tat tadeva itharo janā*, meaning that, since the generality of mankind imitate and follow the lead of the great, let the great beware of acting in any but the best and the highest way. So let our philosophy be *śréṣta*, the highest and the best, so that our politics may *become śréṣta*. The greatest sin of that man, in Plato's Vision of Er, who could not choose his destiny well, was that "he had no philosophy."

I pass over unmoved the suggestion made that "Hinduism is not a religion of non-violence," since, in my opinion, *no* religion is based on violence; the confusion here always arises between our failure to distinguish between what is preached and what is practised in a religion. If Hinduism was not before based on non-violence, the failure of Gandhian politics must be counted a success for Gandhian religion; since, according to the author's argument, non-violence is only "a religious ideal for the individual" and politics and religion are distinct, this must mean that the Gandhian philosophy has provided Hinduism, *i. e.*, as a religion and as an "ideal for the individual," with a new philosophical basis and transformed Hinduism into Hinduism after all.

On page 340 it is suggested that "violence can be a duty." Supposing it is, *to whom* is it a duty? The author seems to mean that to repay violence with violence is a duty. If "violence can be a duty," it must be a "duty" to *start* violence as well, since what is a *duty* is a law universal, and so violence is a law universal, *i. e., what ought to be* (and not something permissible only), which I suppose is not the meaning of the author. There is in the maxim, "Violence can be a duty," the crude ethics which defines Justice as "doing good to friends and evil to enemies." If history has shown anything at all clearly and beyond doubt, it is that "doing evil to enemies" will not improve human relations but deteriorate them.

> "Undoubtedly he ought to injure the wicked who are his enemies."
>
> "And when horses are injured, are they improved or deteriorated?"
>
> "The latter."
>
> "Deteriorated, that is to say, in the good qualities of horses, not of dogs?"
>
> "Yes, of horses."
>
> "And dogs are deteriorated in the good qualities of dogs, and not of horses?"
>
> "Of course."
>
> "And will not men who are injured be deteriorated in that which is the proper virtue of man? in their proper human virtue?"
>
> "Certainly."
>
> (*The Republic*, Book I)

So, there is a Socratic justification for Gandhiji's protest against the employment of violence against the Hurs of Sind, with which the author disagrees.

The author recognises non-violence as a *religious ideal for the individual;* he denies its being a *social or political weapon.*" (Author's italics). This is only a manner of speaking.

"I will tell you, I replied, justice, which is the subject of our inquiry, is, as you know, sometimes spoken of as the virtue of an individual, and sometimes as the virtue of the State."

So is Non-Violence sometimes spoken of as the virtue of an individual, and sometimes as the virtue of the State. Speaking of the parallel between the individual and the social aggregate made by Plato throughout *The Republic*, Walter Pater said: Plato "assumed rather than demonstrated so facile a parallelism." Now, the *separation* of the individual from the social aggregate in the distinction made between "an ideal for the individual" and a "social or political" ideal or weapon, is also "assumed rather than demonstrated," and the contrast is as facile as the parallelism. In either case we have to *begin* with the individual and go on to that other Individual, the State or the social aggregate —that great "Beast." If the parallelism and the distinction between an individual and the social aggregate are both assumptions, the question is: which is the better of the two?

The essay makes a reference to the *Gita;* to that famous verse which declares the immortality of the soul in the words: *na ayam hanti na hanyate* (he neither kills, nor is killed). To this is added Krishna's stern rebuke to Arjuna and from both the conclusion is drawn that "violence can be a duty" and that "it is quite consistent with the highest form of spiritual life and thought." And the author adds: "Knowing all that, *on the plane of action* we cannot get away from our duty, however irksome or unpleasant it may be." (Italics mine).

Now, this passage in the *Gita*, often misunderstood, is the refuge of all who either fail to understand the doctrine of non-violence or, disagreeing with it, seek to found their disagreement on the authority of a great text. If Arjuna's reluctance to fight was a sign of his "non-violence," was his part in the battle, later, a proof that he found in "violence" his duty? If those who suppose violence a duty and those who think non-violence the only duty, go to the *Gita*, as Gandhiji says he does, for authority, let us ask, at least, what these words, "violence" and "non-violence" mean. The "non-violence" of Arjuna was no more justifiable on the battle-field of *Kurukṣetra* than the non-violent non-intervention, the weak-kneed economic sanctions, of the Great Powers in the Italian invasion of helpless Abyssinia. That sort of non-violence in international politics is no more justifiable than the violence of a Hitler in the neighbourly relations of individuals.

Because the soul is immortal, it does not follow that killing must be a joy and a duty—doing God's duty on the earth—and is an additional proof of the immortality of the soul. The fact that all are "killed," that is, that all are mortal, whether arrayed on the battle-field or not, does not mean that it should be a matter of indifference to us whether we live or whether we let others live. The difficulty here, which

is very great, is not due to the impracticability of a sound metaphysics, since any metaphysics worth the name must satisfy, as Bradley said, "the main demands of our nature," the greatest of which is synthesis between our theory and our practice; while the more rational an ethics is, the more metaphysical it is in its postulates.

Arjuna was not a *Satyāgrahi*, as is wrongly supposed, because he gave utterance, more poignantly perhaps than anybody else in literature, to those mere sentiments of the man of *mood*, irresolute in despair and dejection, abandoning therefore what he should have done, as he might have given utterance, the very next moment maybe, to anger and hatred and acted only in the resolution of those feelings, making, in either case, a *tragedy* of action. *Prakrithi tvām niyokshyati*, said Krishna to Arjuna: Nature will compel you to act.

If he had not acted on Krishna's Philosophy of Action, it is not that Arjuna would never have acted. He would have acted, as he had in the past, I suppose, as a *born Kshatriya*, *i. e.*, on the instincts and impulses of his inborn *Kshatriya* (Warrior) nature —for there is the pugnacious in man and greed too—in anger and in violence; like a *goonda* and unlike a hero, *i. e.*, unlike the *true Kshatriya* that he became through Krishna's Philosophy. So there are, really, *two planes of action*. Inspired and taught by Krishna's Philosophy of Action Arjuna, it is true, fought; but without "the *fever* of battle": *Vigatjvarah*, as it is said.

Now it is the other way, *i. e.*, *with the fever of battle*, in which India would probably have acted to attain her independence, imitating other revolutions in history, and using terrorism, which I am willing to admit is a "social or political weapon," one which the Jews unfortunately are using now and which the *goondas* have used here; and her independence would be yet to come. An independence so won would not have been *Swaraj*, but *goonda raj*.

Under Gandhi, India chose to act a little differently and, though her battle for freedom and unity is but half or almost won, she has by her little successes and by her noble failures set an example to other dependent nations; to the Great Powers in their relations amongst themselves. This achievement, or the philosophy behind it, is of such an order that Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy declares in the same number of THE ARYAN PATH: "We in the West want Gandhi's India and no other."

A little of the Gandhian philosophy of action, which is not a "theoretical belief" about Love, will yet save the world, since the principle in action always is: *Svalpamapi asya dharmasya trāyete mahato bhayat;* even a *little* of this *dharma* saves us from great (and imminent) danger, and the danger to the world is undoubtedly very great and very imminent.

But the truth is: those who differ from the Gandhian *creed* of non-violence as well as those who support it as a *policy* and not as a creed, have one thing in common: they look upon non-violence as an *exception* to a Law of Nature and so both deserve the gentle rebuke in the *Gita: prājnāvādāmscha bhāshase*: "you talk as if you know," and such talk is the greatest obstacle, always, either to the knowledge of truth or to its practice. To Gandhiji Non-Violence *is* a Law of Nature and

not an exception to it. But history, by which we mean a record of wars, is not a record of the course of Nature but a record of "the interruption of the course of Nature," as Gandhiji said in *Hind Swaraj*. Alluding to the Gandhian advice: Die like a *Satyāgrahi*, Shri G. R. Malkani says: "Our satyāgraha would not make any news." He is quite right. *Satyāgraha* never made any news in history but it always was, and is, and will be, in spite of the madness and fury of peoples and nations. This is a "Copernican revolution" in our knowledge of human nature and history; a revolution in our minds alone will enable us to judge the truth and practicability of Non-Violence.

N. A. NIKAM

Basavangudi, Bangalore,
15th August, 1947.

COLOUR PREJUDICE

Prof. Oliver C. Cox maintains in the June ARYAN PATH that colour prejudice has existed only since 1492, and only among the white races. He concludes that it is exclusively an outcome of economic rivalry, and therefore to be put to the account of capitalism.

There is good evidence that colour prejudice existed among the ancient Indians, and it is still found among their modern descendants. Perhaps this early colour prejudice came from the white Aryans; but their economy was not capitalistic.

The root of this prejudice is evidently more irrational and much deeper, in the psycho-analytic sense, than mere economic rivalry. First, notice the close connection of the prejudice with sex. There have been colour riots in America on account of economic rivalry, but many lynchings have been due to sex affairs. Consider, then, the British attitude of tolerance towards the "fraternisation" of British soldiers with German girls since the war, although there had been so much ill-feeling against the Germans. Contrast this with the frequent use of words like "taint," "pollution" and "coloured blood" in discussion of mixed marriages and their offspring.

Law or custom or prejudice imposes restrictions upon marriage outside one's own group. The difference of skin colour seems to emphasise and dramatise reactions to these restrictions. The sight of a dark skin calls up with special power the feelings underlying these taboos, the temptation to sex relations and the related feelings of guilt and repugnance. To the White unconscious, the Negro, or in general the dark-skinned person, stands for sexual transgression, for sin.

Notice that dark colours in general are associated with evil and danger. Doubtless this is because of the darkness of night, of thunder-clouds, of dense forests, etc., but it is also, according to the psychoanalysts, because of fæces, pollution with which is one of the earliest acts for which the child is punished by the parent, and is thus a prototype of sin.

These are the deeper unconscious sources of the prejudice against dark-skinned people. Normally they produce no more than a slight repugnance at the sight of a dark skin; but if some stimulus occurs to release it, a flood of hostile feeling is likely to burst forth.

This view of colour prejudice is confirmed by the facts of its distribution. It is significant that the ancient Indians and the modern Hindus, who are conspicuously colour-conscious, are also distinguished by the elaborate precautions they take against pollution, and by the multiplicity of their marriage-bars. Hutton agrees that the fear of pollution is an important ingredient in caste.

It is also significant that among Christian Whites colour prejudice is conspicuously stronger in Protestant countries and communities than among the followers of the Roman and Orthodox Churches. Professor Cox rightly remarks that European colour prejudice appears only after 1492, but he is wrong in attributing this to capitalism: it is due to Protestantism. It was the Protestants who developed most strongly the sense of sin, the passion for gold and for cleanliness and neatness, the horror of waste and of fleshly lust, and the conception that salvation is only for a chosen few. This last led to the multiplication of sects, a decline in the feeling of human solidarity and a willingness to regard whole groups of fellow-beings as tainted with sin and condemned to eternal fire; while the Protestants' ascetic self-suppression increased the aggressiveness on occasion turned against the Sons of Belial.

All these tendencies can find expression in hostility to dark-skinned people. This is why Africans are so much better treated in Southern Europe and South America than in the northern parts of those continents.

I have no desire to apologise for colour prejudice. I dislike it and realise its dangers. Nor do I claim that the suggestion here made as to its origin points to any quick way to cure it. All I would say is that it is better to know what we are up against; and that, even if this account of the matter is wrong, it cannot be doubted that colour prejudice has deeper psychological roots than other group rivalries.

P. SPRATT

Bangalore.

INDIA'S FREEDOM AND THE WORLD

The comment of Mr. Henry A. Wallace, former Vice-President of the U. S. A., on India's acquirement of freedom, was almost lost in the spate of messages and congratulations. It deserves to be remembered. "The independence of India," he declared, "is an event so dramatic that it will take mankind generations to realise its full significance."

No one can attempt to judge the greatness of India's future contributions to the comity of nations. We only know it will change the entire nature of the world we live in.

That that change may be for the better must be the ceaseless spur to effort on the part of all of us. To Indians today the words of Lincoln to his people most forcefully apply, for by our actions, by our measuring up to our responsibilities or by our failure, "we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

SCIENCE AND WAR

SIR HENRY DALE'S PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Sir Henry Dale's Presidential Address at this year's meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science is inevitably concerned first and last with the impact of war upon scientific activity. Indeed since the Association's last meeting on August 30th, 1939, science, it would seem, has been concerned with little else but war. Sir Henry is now anxious to beat "swords into ploughshares." And this phrase was adopted by the Council of the Association as a motto for the meeting. Nevertheless he is compelled to devote much of his address to showing how in almost all fields of research the menace and demands of war provided an immense stimulus such as the conditions of peace have never produced. Sir Henry admits "the perversion of science which war research involves through its particular business with the means of slaughter and destruction," but against this he sets a host of incidental and compensating gains "both of science itself and of mankind through science" from researches required by war.

And when, later in his address, he considers the dangers to science arising out of its conscription for war, he is careful never to suggest that scientists were under any moral obligation to refuse to feed the fires of destruction. This fundamental question he never really faces. He is concerned lest scientists who have devoted nearly the whole of their thoughts and efforts, during six years or more, to practical problems presented to them for rapid solution should find it difficult to shake off quickly "the policy of trading for quick returns." He reminds his fellow-scientists that they should give their first care "to the extension of fundamental knowledge, unconstrained by aim at any practical objective." He believes that

> under conditions now to be faced, the building up of our scientific capital of fundamental knowledge by those who have the creative gift, should have a prior claim over its practical exploitation and over any cultivation of its political influence.

This is well enough as far as it goes. But between this insistence upon the creative mission of science and the account he goes on to render of the part science played in the second world-war, in which it became "a weapon and a combatant in itself," inflicting death and destruction indiscriminately, at rapidly growing ranges and on an ever-increasing scale, there is a curious inconsistency. Of course he proclaims the dangers of the atomic bombs and of worse to follow, "if *the nations* should persist in the desperate project of using further advances in this or any other department of science" for their mutual annihilation. Equally sincerely he declares his own and his brother scientists' hatred of the perversion of science which such a policy involves. But this would be more convincing if men of science had shown any clear sign of refusing to be the tools of national policies. Sir Henry may fear some of the professional consequences of what he calls "a devotion so complete to the service of war," but he never suggests that it reflects in any way on the in-

tegrity of the kind of science he represents. And the gains to science he attributes to the stimulus of war betray even more clearly how oblivious he is of its fatal one-sidedness. But for the war, he declares,

> the world might have had to wait for many decades of unbroken peace to reach a point of such possibilities, for new departures and rapid advances in a whole range of the fundamental sciences and of their applications in medicine and engineering alike. War immensely accelerated the arrival of this opportunity for science, but, in doing so, compromised the peaceful enjoyment of it by the hideous threat of its further abuse in war.

That such acceleration, like the rapid pulse of the fever patient, is not a sign of health, and that the fact that it was induced by war is itself ominous and almost ensures its further abuse in war, Sir Henry completely overlooks. The truth is that by focussing his attention exclusively on the material plane in disregard of spiritual values the modern scientist of the orthodox school has discovered many things prematurely from the stand-point of the healthy, integral development of society or even of his own capacity to use and develop his discoveries for the real good of humanity. In that real sense many of his discoveries are impious. They reflect, in some degree at least, a pride of mind, an acquisitive curiosity, even a lust for power, insufficiently redeemed by charity and humility. Inevitably, therefore, they are more destructive than creative and war itself immensely stimulates them. Sir Henry Dale is pained that many people today

> through genuine misunderstanding and confusion of thought, are looking askance at science, imputing to science itself the danger, with which a misuse of its gifts to mankind still threatens the future of the world, and imagining science to be concerned, in any case, with material issues alone, and as playing, therefore, no part, or even a negative one, in the spiritual and cultural equipment of mankind.

He admits that such "misunderstanding" is hardly surprising after six years of complete absorption by science in the technical aspects of war, but his own efforts to expose and counteract it are disingenuous. So long as scientists are the priests and practitioners of a doctrine which detaches method, however patiently and scrupulously pursued, from the world of inner value, they are as much a menace to the integral development of life as their opposite, the priests of a rigid religious creed. Real growth in knowledge and being calls for an integral science, in which the split between spirit and matter, value and phenomena is healed, a science in which controlled observation has matured into a creative seership that reads nature from hidden divine centre to circumference as a whole, because its practitioners are whole in themselves. Only in such science can there be the really beneficent promise to mankind and the intrinsic beauty and truth which Sir Henry invokes at the end of his address.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ *ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

Sir Mirza Ismail's call to action which appeared in *The Bombay Chronicle's* second *Freedom Supplement* on August 22nd was a memorable piece of writing. On the eve of freedom Indians were dreaming of the new life that was beginning,

> and it is in dreams that man's greatest achievements are born; but they can come of age only in the kingdoms of creative thought and labour—never in any dreamland fantasy.

From our forefathers, he wrote, we have inherited much, but we cannot rest content with that. "With our own hands we must shape our destiny, gaining the more through what we already have."

> Planning there must be, but all planning is futile without action. It is by our deeds that our children and grandchildren will judge us. Let us, therefore, take up the tools and build, like good craftsmen, stone upon stone.

To work! The stones are ready to be hewn.

The Great Books Foundation of Chicago is undertaking a nation-wide community project with great promise for the development and spread of breadth of outlook. Its programme, an offshoot of the Chicago University's "Great Books" seminars, financed by the Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., private donors and the sale of the selected readings, is described editorially by Mr. Norman Cousins in his *Saturday Review of Literature* for 21st June.

There is no ulterior propaganda motive; the Foundation proposes merely "to help start and operate great-books discussion groups throughout the nation to be run under community leadership." Special training courses are offered to prospective discussion leaders, each of whom will stimulate, not dominate, discussion within a group of thirty to forty neighbours.

The 432 readings made available in booklet form are from some 54 authors, "from Homer to Freud." Critics have deplored the emphasis in the selection upon the past, but Mr. Cousins wisely repudiates the notion "that only current books are useful in considering current problems." He declares: "...there are at least a dozen titles on the great-books list which provide a vital background of perspective and historical values for meeting the issues of 1947."

For our part, we hope the net has been sufficiently widely cast to take in some of the great writers of the ancient East, essential ingredients in a prescription for a true world view.

The possibilities of such a project for an enlightened and tolerant public opinion should be most carefully considered by India's educational and cultural leaders.

In this connection it will, perhaps, interest our readers to know that under the auspices of the Indian Institute of Culture, Bangalore, a Discussion Group has been started recently. Since its in-

ception in early July, Aldous Huxley's *Perennial Philosophy*, Kahlil Gibran's *Tears and Laughter* and *Spirits Rebellious*, Benedetto Croce's *Politics and Morals*, Mark Schorer's study in William Blake's visions, entitled *William Blake: Politics of Vision*, and Plato's *Four Dialogues* with Translations and Notes by John Stuart Mill (for the first time published in book form) have been reviewed, in turn, each fortnight, in the form of thirty-minute *résumés* of the contents of the books, questions suggested thereby answered and discussions on the themes stimulated, in the presence of audiences numbering from fifty to sixty and representing the literati and intelligentsia of the city. The Group's periodical meetings thus provide the much-needed vitamins for promoting the mental and spiritual health of the thinking strata of society.

"The national balance-sheet may begin with an inventory of natural and material assets, but the final figure is always based on moral standing," declares Mr. Norman Cousins editorially in *The Saturday Review of Literature*, 5th July. The various nations are making their "songs of national greatness," the difficulty with which is "that they are too easy to strut to; and strutting and marching are not far apart."

> If the setting-up exercises for the next war are to be arrested, some higher quality than national egotisms may have to be invoked, if humanly possible. Perhaps wisdom or conscience, or both; who knows? One suspects that the real trouble is not national sovereignty but national egotisms—much more combustible....

The proof of national greatness, Mr. Norman Cousins holds, lies in purposeful leadership. Especially pertinent to India, however, just over the threshold of emancipation, are the words which he quotes from Thomas Jefferson, who "never counted our blessings without also counting our responsibilities." He wrote of the United States: "This country, which has given to the world the example of physical liberty, owes to it that of moral emancipation also."

The need for national moral greatness is still there and the opportunity lies before India no less than before the United States—rather more before India, in the light of her trusteeship of ancient wisdom—

> to lead the way in a vast liberation from national egotisms,...proclaiming larger and higher allegiances than we have yet known.